

## **Anti-Imperial Subtexts in Paul: An Attempt at Building a Firmer Foundation**

Within the last decade or so interest in so-called “anti-imperial” or “post-colonial” readings of Paul has grown immensely in Anglo-American scholarly circles. Though they seem to have especially flourished in the political climate of the Bush era, it is likely that the topic will continue to be of interest among theologians in the English-speaking world for some time to come, not least due to the fact that the term “Empire” is no longer being used in its conventional political sense. Rather, it has become a catchword for any power structures deemed hegemonic and harmful, whether spiritual, economic, ecological or otherwise. The “anti-imperial Paul” is likely to find himself fighting any number of battles the real Paul never even imagined: against globalization and hedge funds; for gay marriage and polar bears. Thus, a great deal is at stake in the debate about Paul and Empire. One’s position has implications for a whole host of questions.

### I. Problems confronting the thesis of an “anti-imperial” Paul

#### *1. Lack of Direct Anti-Roman Rhetoric*

In some quarters the discussion proceeds as if it were an established fact that Paul articulated an anti-imperial theology, but valid questions remain. Luke certainly does not present Paul as a subversive figure; in fact, he is at pains to defend Paul against the charges brought against him as an anti-Roman agitator. Indeed, he portrays him as a Roman citizen who is very much aware of the benefits Rome has bestowed on him. Yet even if one discounts Luke’s portrait of Paul as a tendentious piece of propaganda designed to rehabilitate his hero in Roman eyes, we are still confronted by a lack of explicit statements by Paul that could be construed as subversive.

It may well be argued that it would be unreasonable to expect them. Authoritarian regimes like Rome simply do not tolerate that sort of rhetoric<sup>(1)</sup>, and no person who availed himself of public *fora* in the

(1) Cf. V. RUDICH, *Political Dissidence under Nero*. The Price of Dissimulation (London 1993) 242: “On the balance of evidence, the Julio-Claudian regime

Roman Empire could have lasted long if he resorted to it. That Paul made such statements was, of course, the very line of attack pursued by his enemies within the Jewish community. According to Luke, Paul's brief imprisonment in Philippi resulted from charges that he was, in fact, involved in anti-Roman sedition (cf. Acts 16,21), an accusation that followed him to Thessaloniki, as well (cf. Acts 17,7), and his long imprisonment in Caesarea was due to the political intrigues of various Roman officials who were responsible for determining whether Paul had been guilty of the same crime in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 23,28-29; 25,8-9.18-19; 26,31). The fact that Paul was not condemned for sedition until the latter part of Nero's reign, when the emperor was becoming increasingly capricious and dangerous, demonstrates how careful the Apostle must have been to avoid overt remarks that could be construed as anti-Roman<sup>(2)</sup>.

## 2. Paul's Positive View of the Roman State (Rom 13,1-7)

Still, Paul's caution cannot explain the fact that he seems to lend unequivocal support to Rome as a divinely sanctioned authority in the one passage in which he actually discusses the relationship of Christians to the imperial state: Rom 13,1-7. From time to time it has been argued that Paul's favorable view of the Roman government here is conditioned by the time at which he wrote it: in the first half of Nero's reign, when it still seemed likely that Nero would, under Seneca's and Burrus' influence, develop into a wise and humane ruler<sup>(3)</sup>. Paul's reference to the "authorities" (ἐξουσίαι), however, likely translates the Latin *potestates*, a term that referred to a broad range of Roman officials<sup>(4)</sup>. Thus, Paul is probably not thinking about

---

appears as vicious as any modern dictatorship, with the difference that it lacked the technology that in our age provides the means of total control".

(<sup>2</sup>) Cf. RUDICH, *Nero*, xxiii: "[First,] writers and orators of the epoch were actually aware of the fact that their discourse could be subjected at any point to a 'prejudiced interpretation' by a benevolent or malevolent, dissident or censorious reader. Second, any text or speech could theoretically be charged with an intention to do harm. A Julio-Claudian public figure had to step cautiously, with an eye to every word issuing from his pen or his mouth ...".

(<sup>3</sup>) Cf. e.g. Th. ZAHN, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig 1910) 558; R. JEWETT, *Romans. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2007) 793.

(<sup>4</sup>) Cf. V. ZSIFKOVITS, *Der Staatsgedanke nach Paulus in Röm 13,1-7, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Umwelt und der patristischen Auslegung* (Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 8; Wien 1964) 64-65; A. STROBEL, "Zum Verständnis von Röm 13", *ZNW* 47 (1956) 79.

dealings with the emperor at all, but about the interactions of average Christians with Roman magistrates at the local level, where both he and his readers would have been well aware of the potential for abuse. That is not to say, though, that the passage is only relevant to the specific situation in Rome. Paul's argument reflects a broad Jewish perspective concerning the subordination of all human government to the divine will<sup>(5)</sup>. Thus, regardless of whether one wishes to read Rom 13,1-7 narrowly within its historical context or broadly as a reflection of a larger theological principle, it seems, in principle at least, to affirm the God-given authority of the Roman state.

This does not mean, of course, that Rom 13,1-7 is a theological *carte blanche* for any and all use (or abuse) of government power. In fact, it admirably circumscribes the power of the state by stressing its subservience to God, leaving little room for the self-aggrandizing imperialist vision of Rome. On this basis some recent interpreters have suggested that Rom 13,1-7 is actually quite subversive in intent. Neil Elliott argues that Paul's injunction to submit to Rome is "remarkably ambivalent" and that its hidden message is: "The Empire is as dangerous as it has ever been. Nothing has changed. Exercise caution"<sup>(6)</sup>. Jewett believes that, by attributing the origin of Roman magisterial government to God, Paul is making a "revolutionary statement" that would have certainly been viewed as subversive had the Romans only understood it<sup>(7)</sup>. Ultimately, though, this line of argumentation seems somewhat contrived. The fact is that Rom 13,1-7 clearly recognizes the legitimacy of the Roman government. Indeed, the preceding pericope's injunction to "live at peace with all men, as far as possible" (Rom 12,18), seems to implicitly recognize the benefits the *pax romana* has bestowed upon Christians. In any case, it remains to be proven that Paul's impulse to prescribe limits on Rome's executive power, even by appealing to God, would have been viewed as subversive by Roman magistrates and lawyers. Rome's illustrious republican traditions had, after all, not been altogether forgotten.

(5) Cf. S. KIM, *Christ and Caesar*. The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke (Grand Rapids, MI 2008) 37-38.

(6) N. ELLIOT, "Strategies of Resistance", *Hidden Transcripts and the Arts of Resistance*. Applying the Work of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul (ed. R.A. HORSLEY) (Semeia Studies 48; Atlanta, GA 2004) 121.

(7) JEWETT, *Romans*, 789-790.

### 3. *The Difficulty in Identifying Anti-Imperial Subtexts in Paul*

In view of the absence of direct evidence, proponents of an anti-imperial Paul have turned their attention to examining the subtext of Paul's writing. This is, of course, unobjectionable in principle, at least since modern literary analysis has made us aware of the powerful semiotic force of what might be lying "between the lines" of a text. But getting at subtexts can be a problem, especially when we are dealing with texts in different languages from different cultures, particularly ancient ones. Many scholars believe Paul's anti-imperialist subversive subtext is most accessible via his conspicuous choice of vocabulary. Horsley, for example, argues that "[t]he starting point in recognizing that Paul was preaching an anti-imperial gospel is that much of his key language would have evoked echoes of the imperial cult and ideology"<sup>(8)</sup>. Horsley and those sympathetic to his position argue that Paul consciously appropriated and thereby subverted certain catchwords that in their 1<sup>st</sup> century context were often associated with Roman conventions and institutions. These include some from the standard stock of quasi-technical terms frequently used by the early Church such as εὐαγγέλιον<sup>(9)</sup>, δικαιοσύνη<sup>(10)</sup>, ἐκκλησία<sup>(11)</sup>, and παρουσία<sup>(12)</sup>. No one argues this case more unabashedly than Dieter Georgi in his discussion of Paul's Letter to the Romans:

[E]very page of the letter contains indications that Paul has very concrete and critical objections to the dominant political theology of the Roman Empire... By using such loaded terms as *euangelion*, *pistis*, *dikaioynē*, and *eirenē* as central concepts in Romans, he evokes their associations to Roman political theology"<sup>(13)</sup>.

<sup>(8)</sup> R.A. HORSLEY, "Paul's Counter-Imperial Gospel: Introduction", *Paul and Empire*. Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society (ed. R.A. HORSLEY) (Harrisburg, PA 1997) 140.

<sup>(9)</sup> Cf. N.T. WRIGHT, *What Saint Paul Really Said*. Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity? (Grand Rapids, MI 1997) 43.

<sup>(10)</sup> Cf. N. ELLIOT, "The Apostle Paul and Empire", *In the Shadow of Empire*. Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance (ed. R.A. HORSLEY) (Louisville, KY 2008) 98; N.T. WRIGHT, "Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire", *Paul and Politics*. Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl (ed. R.A. HORSLEY) (Harrisburg, PA 2000) 170-172.

<sup>(11)</sup> Cf. HORSLEY, "Building an Alternative Society: Introduction", *Paul and Empire*, 209.

<sup>(12)</sup> Cf. J.R. HARRISON, "Paul and the Imperial Gospel at Thessaloniki", *JSNT* 25 (2002) 82-83.

<sup>(13)</sup> D. GEORGI, "God Turned Upside Down", *Paul and Empire*, 148.



Georgi has recently garnered strong support from Robert Jewett. In his massive and erudite commentary, Jewett argues that Romans is an “anti-imperialist letter” that “comprises the antithesis of official propaganda about Rome’s superior piety, justice, and honor”<sup>(14)</sup>. The letter of Romans, far from being a theological treatise, is nothing less than Paul’s answer to Rome’s usurpation of God’s rightful power. Jewett, like Georgi, is convinced that the vocabulary of Romans, with its parallels in Roman imperial propaganda, makes this abundantly clear<sup>(15)</sup>.

By far the most important term seen by some scholars as anti-imperial in its intent is κύριος. Harrison notes that the term was used from the time of Augustus in propagating the imperial cult<sup>(16)</sup>. For Wright this fact takes on tremendous importance. While he does not neglect the important OT resonances of the term in Paul, he argues that by calling Jesus κύριος, Paul is consciously and with equal conviction maintaining that Caesar is not the κύριος<sup>(17)</sup>. This line of reasoning is followed by many others, and it would certainly constitute *prima facie* evidence in favor of the thesis that Paul was trying to subvert Rome, if it could be proven.

The argument from vocabulary, however, labors under several problems: First, every one of the terms mentioned by Georgi has a rich Septuagintal tradition. As Denny Burk notes, “it is manifestly clear that Paul’s selection of terms is driven in large part by his interface with the LXX Scriptures”<sup>(18)</sup>. Indeed, it is hard to see how anyone wanting to proclaim in Greek the message that Jesus of Nazareth represented the culmination of OT prophetic expectations could have done so without recourse to that vocabulary. And if one wanted to bring Jesus into the closest of associations with Israel’s God, as Bauckham<sup>(19)</sup> and Hurtado<sup>(20)</sup> have demonstrated it was earliest Christianity’s desire to do, then the term κύριος is likely the first one they would have appropriated.

<sup>(14)</sup> JEWETT, *Romans*, 2, 49.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. e.g. JEWETT’s (*Romans*, 138–139) analysis of the term σωτηρία.

<sup>(16)</sup> HARRISON, “Thessaloniki”, 78.

<sup>(17)</sup> Cf. WRIGHT, *Saint Paul*, 88; Id., “Paul’s Gospel”, 174.

<sup>(18)</sup> D. BURK, “Is Paul’s Gospel Counterimperial? Evaluating the Prospects of the ‘Fresh Perspective’ for Evangelical Theology”, *JETS* 51 (2008) 317.

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. R. BAUCKHAM, *God Crucified*. Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 4.

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. L.W. HURTADO, *Lord Jesus Christ*. Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity (Grand Rapids, MI 2003) 3.

This leads to a second problem, since much of the vocabulary in question was already part of the early Church's idiolect before Paul took up his pen. The term κύριος was certainly already being used with reference to Jesus in the Jerusalem church<sup>(21)</sup>, and it is difficult to imagine that it or other terms in use there in 30's and 40's were chosen for their anti-imperial implications. With regard to Paul, this means we have to be careful about arguments that rest too strongly on his choice of vocabulary. Any terms that were part of the standard repertoire of earliest Christian quasi-technical terms were not chosen by Paul due to their anti-imperial or, for that matter, any other connotations. They were chosen for him by others, and he could hardly have avoided using them, even if he had wanted to. The problem here, of course, is that we have no direct recourse to pre-Pauline Christianity except via Paul, unless one dates the Letter of James early, as an increasing number of scholars, not to mention myself, are inclined to do. In that event, many characteristically Pauline terms, including πίστις, εἰρήνη, and even δικαιοσύνη suddenly evidence a pre-Pauline pedigree which, of course, further weakens the argument from vocabulary. Still, it is best not to build an elaborate case on the presumption of an early dating of James.

Third, the argument from vocabulary needs to be shored up methodologically. To a certain extent, scholars have begun to address this deficit. Neil Elliot, for instance, has attempted to construct a more solid methodology for the identification of subtexts<sup>(22)</sup>. Drawing on the political theory of James C. Scott<sup>(23)</sup>, he posits the presence of "hidden transcripts" behind Paul's public utterances. While existence of such "hidden transcripts" is hardly open to doubt, definitively identifying them in ancient texts is no easy task. To that end, Elliot appropriates Richard Hays' criteria for identifying intertextual "echoes" in Paul<sup>(24)</sup> to the task of identifying subtexts, but this assumes an interchangeability between "subtext" (or "hidden transcript") and "pre-text" (or "im-

<sup>(21)</sup> Cf. J.D.G. DUNN, *Beginning from Jerusalem* (Christianity in the Making 2; Grand Rapids, MI 2009) 217.

<sup>(22)</sup> Cf. N. ELLIOT, "'Blasphemed among the Nations': Pursuing an Anti-Imperial 'Intertextuality' in Romans", *As it is Written*. Studying Paul's Use of Scripture (eds. S.E. PORTER – C.D. STANLEY) (Symposium 50; Atlanta, GA 2008) 213-233.

<sup>(23)</sup> Cf. J.C. SCOTT, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. Hidden Transcripts (New Haven, CT 1990).

<sup>(24)</sup> Cf. R. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989) 29-32.

bedded text”) which is by no means self-evident. These are manifestly different textual phenomena. Clearly, more work is needed.

Among other necessary measures, I would argue that Popper’s criterion of falsifiability<sup>(25)</sup> should be rigorously applied to anti-imperial readings of Paul. Proponents of such readings must delineate the circumstances under which terms used both by Paul and Rome should *not* be viewed as anti-imperial in their force. A cross check of the data in other sources would also be useful. Does the use of the terms in question by other Jewish writers (Philo, for example) reveal that they are inherently anti-imperial? Do other Jewish writers who are more amenable to Rome (Josephus comes immediately to mind) avoid them for precisely that reason? I suspect that the answer in both cases is no.

#### 4. *Anti-Imperial Exegesis of Pauline Texts: a Brief Assessment*

Lack of methodological rigor has led to identification of some unlikely Pauline passages as subversive in their intent. Walsh and Keesmaat argue, for instance, that Paul’s metaphorical statement that both his Gospel (Col 1,6) and the Colossians’ faith (Col 1,10) are “bearing fruit and increasing” is subversive because it denies that Rome is the source of fruitful abundance<sup>(26)</sup>. Richard DeMaris has recently posited that water baptism in Corinth was a subversive symbol that functioned as “a response to Roman hegemonic control of water”<sup>(27)</sup>. Such readings seem more indebted to a predetermination that Paul letters must be full of subversive content rather than to a careful sifting of the evidence.

It would, however, be foolish to disregard the possibility that subversive subtexts are present elsewhere in Paul. Three passages, in particular, have been the subject of intense post-colonial scrutiny and seem worthy of more serious consideration. The first two are found in 1 Thessalonians, the one letter that even some skeptics view as amenable to anti-imperial readings of Paul<sup>(28)</sup>.

<sup>(25)</sup> Cf. K. POPPER, “Falsifikationismus oder Konventionalismus”, *Karl Popper Lesebuch*. Ausgewählte Texte zu Erkenntnistheorie, Philosophie der Naturwissenschaften, Metaphysik, Sozialphilosophie (ed. D. MILLER) (UTB 2000; Tübingen 1997) 127-134.

<sup>(26)</sup> Cf. B. WALSH – S. KEESMAAT, *Colossians Remixed*. Subverting the Empire (Downers Grove, IL 2004) 70.

<sup>(27)</sup> R.E. DEMARIS, *The New Testament in Its Ritual World* (London 2008) 50.

<sup>(28)</sup> Cf. M.W. PAHL, *Paul, the Gospel and Empire*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Providence, Nov. 19, 2008.

## a) 1 Thess 4,13-17

We begin with Paul's description of Christ's coming in 1Thess 4,13-17. Already in 1923 A. Deissmann argued that Paul's use of παρουσία in v. 15 has the same connotation as its Latin equivalent *adventus* in coins where it describes the visits of kings and emperors<sup>(29)</sup>. A few years later E. Peterson's argued that, in using ἀπάντησις in v. 17, Paul had in mind the Hellenistic connotations of the term, specifically in those contexts where it was used to describe the civic welcome accorded imperial visitors<sup>(30)</sup>. Peterson's analysis was so influential that the word has come to be viewed as a *terminus technicus* for such occasions. Harrison maintains, for instance, that "[t]he word was *reserved* for the civic welcome accorded a visiting dignitary or the triumphant entry of a new ruler into the capital of a kingdom"<sup>(31)</sup>.

This interpretation of the background behind 1 Thess 4,13-17 has often been assumed without argument<sup>(32)</sup>, and post-colonial readings take it for granted that, by alluding to it, "Paul is critiquing the imperial propaganda of his day"<sup>(33)</sup>. As attractive as this interpretation seems at first glance, it falls prey to a basic exegetical fallacy by assuming that, since the terms ἀπάντησις and παρουσία carry imperial connotations in certain contexts, those connotations are operative in all other contexts in which they occur. Perhaps sensing this, some scholars have begun to question the longstanding and often uncritical allegiance to the views of Deissmann and Peterson<sup>(34)</sup>. After all, neither of the terms are prominent in Roman imperial literature<sup>(35)</sup>, whereas both terms often occur in decidedly non-Imperial, even banal contexts, in the NT (for ἀπάντησις see Acts 28,15; for παρουσία see 1 Cor 16,17; 2 Cor 7,6, Phil 1,26).

<sup>(29)</sup> Cf. A. DEISSMANN, *Licht vom Osten*. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt (Tübingen 1923) 314-320.

<sup>(30)</sup> Cf. E. PETERSON, "Die Einholung des Kurios (1 Thess. IV.17)", *ZST* 7 (1929-1930) 682-702.

<sup>(31)</sup> HARRISON, "Thessaloniki", 85 (emphasis mine).

<sup>(32)</sup> Cf. F.F. BRUCE, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC 45; Waco, TX 1982) 102-103; C.A. WANAMAKER, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 175.

<sup>(33)</sup> HARRISON, "Thessaloniki", 88.

<sup>(34)</sup> Cf. J. PLEVNIK, *Paul and the Parousia* (Peabody 1997) 4-10, 89-90, who draws heavily on J. DUPONT, *ZYN XPIΣΤΩΙ*. L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul (Louvain 1952).

<sup>(35)</sup> Cf. P. OAKES, "Remapping the Universe: Paul and the Emperor in 1 Thessalonians and Philipians", *JSNT* 27 (2005) 317.

## b) 1 Thess 5,3

The second passage to be considered is 1 Thess 5,3: “When they say, ‘peace and security’ destruction will come upon them suddenly, just as labor pains come upon a pregnant woman, and they will certainly not be able to escape”. The doublet “peace and security” (εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια) is taken by a great many recent commentators to be a slogan summing up the benefits of the *pax romana*. They maintain that Paul references it in an attempt to subvert the imperial ideology by exposing the reality of Roman aggression. This interpretation likewise goes beyond the evidence. While there can be no doubt that both words are often used in Roman imperial propaganda, the commonplace assumption that the Latin phrase *pax et securitas* lies behind the doublet, and further, that it was a well-worn Roman slogan cannot be sustained. The many supporters of this contention offer countless examples of the use of either one word or the other in imperial literature, coins, and inscriptions, but not both together<sup>(36)</sup>. My search of the Perseus database revealed no instances of the slogan in the Latin works. Further, it is not even certain that, at the time Paul was writing 1 Thessalonians, the Roman propaganda machine was making broad use of both concepts. While the *pax*-ideology was standard fare under the Julio-Claudian emperors beginning with Augustus, the *securitas*-component seems to have taken on importance only later. It played virtually no role in imperial propaganda under Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius<sup>(37)</sup>. It was only during the latter part of Nero’s reign that “eine verstärkte Propagierung von *pax* und *securitas* einsetzt”<sup>(38)</sup>. For this reason, Holtz’s conclusion that the doublet in 1 Thess 5,3 contains no allusion to the propaganda of the early Roman empire seems reasonable<sup>(39)</sup>, especially in light of the fact that a

<sup>(36)</sup> Cf. especially the plethora of primary source material that C. VOM BROCKE has amassed in *Thessaloniki, Stadt des Kassander und Gemeinde des Paulus. Eine frühe christliche Gemeinde in ihrer heidnischen Umwelt* (WUNT 2/125; Tübingen 2001) 167-185.

<sup>(37)</sup> Cf. A. KNEPPE, *Metus temporum*. Zur Bedeutung von Angst in Politik und Gesellschaft der römischen Kaiserzeit des 1. und 2. Jhdts. n. Chr. (Stuttgart 1994) 233.

<sup>(38)</sup> KNEPPE, *Metus*, 271.

<sup>(39)</sup> Cf. T. HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* (EKK XIII; Zürich 1986) 215, n. 364.

plausible case can be made for a *traditionsgeschichtliche* link either to the OT prophetic tradition<sup>(40)</sup> or even to Jesus himself<sup>(41)</sup>.

c) Phil 3,20

A third text that plays an important role in post-colonial readings of Paul is Phil 3,20: "For our place of citizenship (πολίτευμα) is in heaven, and it is from there that we eagerly await our Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ". The term *πολίτευμα* can refer to the citizenry, the state of being a citizen, or the place of citizenship, with the latter being most likely. Spicq notes that it was most commonly used to denote "an organization of citizens from the same place, with the same rights (*isonomoi*) in the midst of a foreign state"<sup>(42)</sup>. That meaning certainly makes sense here, and it was a notion that members in the church of Philippi, an important Roman colony, would have understood. The fact that this political term is linked closely with κύριος and σωτήρ has led N.T. Wright to interpret the passage as a call to Christians to render fealty to their true Lord and Savior, rather than Caesar<sup>(43)</sup>. This does, in fact, seem to be the clearest example of a remark in Paul that is undeniably set against an imperial background. Still, even here caution should be exercised since it is not clear to what extent the statement would have been construed as subversive, even by Roman officials<sup>(44)</sup>. First, much of the force of Wright's argument, in particular, is gained by his contention that the anti-imperial tone in Phil 3,20 is also to be assumed in the Christ hymn of Phil 2,6-11<sup>(45)</sup>. Certainly, if that hymn is meant to be a blatant challenge to the present, mundane authority of the emperor, it must be construed as subversive, but there is nothing in the immediate context of Phil 2,6-11 that necessitates such a reading.

Second, one needs to be aware of the danger of importing modern conceptions of citizenship into our understanding of Paul's metaphor. We generally think of citizenship as claim of loyalty by a state that tend to exclude other such claims. In the ancient world, citizenships were honors (with attendant privileges) to be amassed. Paul himself was,

<sup>(40)</sup> Cf. HOLTZ, *Thessalonicher*, 215; PLEVNIK, *Paul*, 103-104.

<sup>(41)</sup> Cf. D. WENHAM, *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 314-316.

<sup>(42)</sup> C. SPICQ, *TLNT* IV, 130.

<sup>(43)</sup> Cf. WRIGHT, "Paul's Gospel", 160-183.

<sup>(44)</sup> Cf. P. OAKES, *Philippians*. From People to Letter (SNTSMS 110; Cambridge 2001) 147: "Paul does not seem to be wishing, as such for Rome's overthrow. He is not writing anti-Roman polemic".

<sup>(45)</sup> Cf. WRIGHT, "Paul's Gospel", 72.

according to Luke, both a citizen of Tarsus and a citizen of Rome, and there is no reason to believe that Rome would have found his dual citizenship problematic. Thus, a claim to citizenship in heaven might have struck Roman officials as odd, but probably not, in and of itself, as an unacceptable competing loyalty. Further, we mustn't forget that, even in Philippi, most members of the church probably did not have and never would have Roman citizenship because *Rome* wouldn't think of granting it to them, and it is not self-evident that Rome would have been bothered by the fact that they claimed citizenship elsewhere.

### *5. In Search of the Right Narrative*

There is, then, no compelling reason for thinking that Paul's letter to the Thessalonians is particularly subversive in its intent, and while Phil 3,20 makes use of a political metaphor, it is not clear that Paul was trying to undermine the Roman empire by means of it. This does not mean, however, that proponents of an anti-imperial Paul are completely wrong, even if they have overstated their case. For it can hardly be denied that Paul's Gospel has a highly subversive quality about it. It really does challenge totalitarian ideologies of all stripes, not least that of imperial Rome. Later in the first century and certainly in the second, Christians in Asia Minor and elsewhere were confronted by the hot anger of Dea Roma once she understood that the claims of the Christians' Lord were indeed incompatible with her own.

How do we, then, account for the difficulty in uncovering subversive subtexts in Paul's letters, even when we sense that they have a definite subversive quality about them? The problem does not lie in the search for subtexts per se. This, as we noted, is quite legitimate; we cannot expect Paul to have made blatantly anti-imperial statements in the context in which he lived and wrote. Rather, the problem lies in the failure of post-colonial interpreters to demonstrate a convincing controlling narrative into which these subtexts are thought to tap. They have generally attempted to ground them, implicitly or explicitly, in Paul's Christological narrative, but, as we noted, the existence of a consciously anti-imperial narrative behind Paul's Christological statements has not been definitively established.

There is, on the other hand, evidence for an alternate narrative in Paul, one that was rooted in a typically Jewish apocalyptic view of history and envisioned the impending demise of the Roman Empire. Its subversive potential was not to be underestimated, as any Roman military or administrative official who served in Palestine in the first

century would have readily attested<sup>(46)</sup>. While Paul affirmed this narrative, it did not originate with him. My thesis, then, is that Paul's theology does indeed contain anti-imperial elements, but that these are more a function of the fundamentally Jewish apocalyptic structure of his eschatology than of his own signature theology and that they are therefore less salient than they otherwise might be. I by no means wish to downplay the radical extent to which Paul's Christology modified his apocalyptic expectations<sup>(47)</sup>, nor do I deny that any number of anti-imperial implications follow from his Christology. I maintain, however, that what may be considered anti-imperial in Paul has its deepest roots, not in his Christology, which was novel *per definitionem*, but in certain Jewish apocalyptic and particularly Danielic conceptions of history that were pervasive in first century Judaism. We turn now to examine these.

## II. Danielic Antecedents to Paul's Anti-Imperial Eschatology

It is now generally accepted that early Jewish eschatology was concrete rather than abstract in its conception. It was not concerned with the coming of the kingdom of God in some transcendent sense, as the liberal theologians of 19<sup>th</sup> century understood it. Rather, early Jewish eschatology looked forward to the re-establishment of God's reign in Israel. Though one must be wary of monolithic assessments of Judaism in the late Second Temple period, it is probably safe to say that most Jews shared a belief that a Davidic Messiah<sup>(48)</sup> would lead the tribes of Israel out of exile, defeat God's enemies and vindicate God's promises to his people<sup>(49)</sup>. There is ample evidence that Jews of that

<sup>(46)</sup> A.D. CALLAHAN, "The Arts of Resistance in an Age of Revolt", *Hidden Transcripts*, 37: "Israelites revolted more than any other people under Roman domination did, and more in the first century of the Common Era than in all other periods of their history combined".

<sup>(47)</sup> I have argued this very point elsewhere. Cf. J. WHITE, *Die Erstlingsgabe im Neuen Testament* (TANZ 45; Tübingen 2007) 141-142.

<sup>(48)</sup> I find W. Horbury's argument that messianism in the Second Temple period was vigorous and widespread entirely convincing. Cf. ID., *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London 1998) 36-63.

<sup>(49)</sup> Cf. esp. N.T. WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (COQG 2; Minneapolis, MN 1996) 202-209, and B. PITRE's fine-tuning of Wright's thesis in *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of Exile*. Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of Atonement (Tübingen 2005) 31-40.



period perceived Rome to be their (and thus God's) ultimate enemy<sup>(50)</sup>, and further, that they believed God would overthrow Rome, the general expectation being that this would happen during the period we call the early Roman Empire<sup>(51)</sup>. While the basic shape of early Jewish eschatological expectations can be traced to various oracles of the canonical Prophets, convictions with regard to the timing of the re-establishment of the reign of God owe their surprising strength almost exclusively to the influence of the book of Daniel. To establish this point I will briefly review the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of three Danielic themes in early Judaism.

### 1. *Daniel's Visions of the Four Kingdoms (Dan 2, 7, 8)*

In Dan 2, we read the story of how Daniel was able both to recount King Nebuchadnezer's dream and to interpret it. The king saw a statue with a head made of gold, chest and arms made of silver, midsection and thighs made of bronze, legs made of iron, and feet made of iron mixed with clay. As the king was watching, a huge stone slammed into the feet of the statue and pulverized it. The stone grew into a great mountain that filled the whole earth (vv. 31-35). Daniel proceeds to explain the dream: The different parts of the statue represent different earthly kingdoms, and the stone symbolizes God's eternal kingdom (vv. 36-45). Daniel specifically identifies the head of the statue with Nebuchadnezer's kingdom, but he does not reveal the identity of the second, third, or fourth kingdoms.

<sup>(50)</sup> This contrasts with the Jews' initial assessment of Rome which was quite positive. 1 Macc 8 relates how Judas Maccabeus heard of Rome's exploits and, hoping for aid from that corner in his struggle against the Seleucids, forged an alliance with the emerging world power. Rome's interest in Judea was thus awakened, to be stilled only after Pompey's triumph over Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. With that, Judea's short-lived semi-autonomy under the Hasmoneans came to an end, and attitudes toward Rome turned sour. The Qumran community was the first to identify Rome with biblical prophecy, sensing that the power of Rome would soon be turned against the Jews. They placed the blame for this disastrous turn of events squarely on the wicked Hasmonean priest and his cohort in Jerusalem (1QpHab IX,9-12). Qumran's impulse, however, was to typologize the Romans with reference to the Babylonians (1QpHab II,10-13), and there is no evidence that they applied their characteristic *peshier* interpretation to the Danielic doctrine of the four kingdoms. Cf. D. FLUSSER, "The Roman Empire in Hasmonean and Essene Eyes", *Judaism of the Second Temple Period* (Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 197.

<sup>(51)</sup> N.T. WRIGHT, *The New Testament and the People of God* (COQG 1; Minneapolis, MN 1992) 307-320.

Dan 7 recounts a vision from the first year of Belshazzar's reign that closely corresponds to Nebuchadnezer's dream. Four beasts come up out of the sea. The first three resemble a lion, a bear, and a leopard, respectively. The fourth one defies description, except for the fact that it was dreadful and strong and possessed huge iron teeth and ten horns. Among the horns, one in particular is singled out for attention. At this juncture the Ancient of Days appears, and the fourth beast is destroyed. The dominion of all the beasts is taken away and given to "one like the Son of Man" (v. 13). Daniel asks an *angelus interpretes* to explain to him the meaning of the vision, and it is revealed to him that the four beasts represent four kingdoms. The analogy to Dan 2, readily apparent in its own right, is thus made explicit. Daniel asks more about the fourth beast, which he finds especially terrifying. He is told that the fourth beast represents a kingdom that will bring the whole earth under its dominion.

Dan 8 describes a vision assigned to the third year of Belshazzar's reign of a ram with two horns that is overpowered by a male goat with one great horn. The large horn breaks and is replaced by four horns, one of which defiles the temple. The angel Gabriel interprets the vision for Daniel: The ram with two horns represents the kings of Media and Persia. The male goat is Greece (or more precisely, the Macedonian empire; the great horn is clearly Alexander). Though Gabriel does not say so explicitly, the four horns undoubtedly represent the Diadochi. The little horn, which grows up and ultimately defiles the temple, obviously symbolizes the Seleucid kingdom, more specifically Antiochus Epiphanes IV.

Within the book of Daniel, at least in its canonical form, the following correspondences are thus obtained<sup>(52)</sup>:

<sup>(52)</sup> There has been, of course, a great deal of discussion as to which kingdoms are actually meant in the original context of Dan 2 and 7, and different authors have arrived at very different conclusions, depending upon their theories of the unity and dating of the book of Daniel. Generally, it is held that Dan 2, 7, and 8 were written by different authors, each using the work of his predecessor or predecessors as a model but contemporizing the historical referents to fit their own context. Cf. I. FRÖHLICH, *'Time and Times and Half a Time'*. Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras (JSPSup 19; Sheffield 1999) 13, 77. For our purposes the discussion is inconsequential, since we are interested only in the way in which Daniel's prophecies were understood in early Judaism, and the canonical form of Daniel is presumed from its earliest traceable point of reception in the period. Cf. G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Minneapolis, MN 2005) 17.

KINGDOM	DANIEL 2	DANIEL 7	DANIEL 8
1. Babylon	golden head*	lion with eagles' wings	-----
2. Media-Persia	silver chest and arms	bear	ram with two horns*
3. Greece (Macedonia)	bronze midriff and thighs	leopard	male goat with large horns*
Diadochi	-----	-----	four horns
Seleucid kingdom (esp. Ant. Epiph. IV)	-----	-----	little horn that grew large
4. ???	iron legs; iron and clay feet	dreadful beast with iron teeth	-----

\*Interpretation explicit in Daniel

Obviously, the identification of the iron legs of Dan 2 and the iron toothed-beast in Dan 7 with Rome is neither explicit nor logically necessary. The author or authors may well have had the Seleucid kingdom in mind, and there is no reason within the context of canonical Daniel for preferring some other interpretation. Nevertheless, by the end of the Second Temple period, the identification of Rome with the fourth kingdom of Dan 2 and with the fourth beast of Dan 7 had become common fare, as a brief glance at the Jewish literature of the time reveals<sup>(53)</sup>.

- a. The Testament of Moses provides a compact overview of Israel's history through the first third of the first century C.E.<sup>(54)</sup> In the brief hymnic section of this work we find these words (*T. Mos.* 10,7-8):

<sup>(53)</sup> Of course, not all first-century recitations of Israel's history follow Daniel's scheme. The fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles, thought to have been updated about 80 C.E. to reflect contemporary conditions, recounts the procession of five world powers across the stage of history — Assyria, Media, Persia, Macedonia, and Rome — possibly following a five-kingdom scheme such as the one known to us from the work of the Roman chronicler Aemillus Sura in ca. 175 B.C.E. Cf. J.J. COLLINS, "The Kingdom of God in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha", *The Kingdom of God in 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Interpretation* (ed. W. WILLIS) (Peabody, MA 1987) 81-82. The presence of such a scheme is not, however, as clear as Collins would have us believe. Collins, who edited the Sibylline Oracles in the Charlesworth edition of the Pseudepigrapha, has himself prejudiced the interpretation of *Sib. Or.* 4 by numbering the powers and referring to them as kingdoms in the headings he gives to the respective sections ("The first kingdom", "The second kingdom", etc.). The text itself gives no warrant for titles that would lead readers to detect a numbered kingdom scheme behind the oracle. In any case, there is no evidence that Daniel has modified this scheme, since even by Collins' reckoning Dan 1-6 predates Aemillus.

<sup>(54)</sup> R. H. Charles' argument for a date between 7 and 30 C.E. still seems convincing despite alternative theories that have occasionally been put forth. Cf.

For God Most high will surge forth, the Eternal One alone.  
 In full view will he come to work vengeance on the nations.  
 Yea, all their idols will he destroy.  
 Then will you be happy, O Israel!  
 And you will mount up above the necks and the wings of an eagle,  
 And they will be brought to an end<sup>(55)</sup>.

The image of Israel mounting up over the necks and wings of an eagle is a complex allusion with multiple connotations, but the eagle would have been understood as a reference to Rome in the first century<sup>(56)</sup>, and this inference probably reflects authorial intent<sup>(57)</sup>. Thus, while the Testament of Moses does not explicitly follow a four-kingdom scheme, it does seem to allude to the fact that the Roman Empire will be replaced by God's eternal kingdom, thus tapping into the latter part of Daniel's prophetic historiography.

- b. The author of the book of Revelation draws upon the Danielic tradition to deftly communicate a subversive message that would have been clear enough to his intended audience (at least the informed readers among them) but difficult to decipher for anyone else. In Rev 13,1-3 he describes a beast with seven heads and ten horns coming out of the sea. The creature has features of a leopard (or panther), a bear, and a lion. Anyone familiar with Dan 7,1-8 would have immediately recognized the beast as a composite of the four animals portrayed in that vision. It seems, then, that the author of Revelation has subsumed features of the first three into the fourth beast, which Dan 7 describes as terrifying and dreadful, in order to depict the horrific nature of the end-time foe of the people of God. This same creature reappears in Rev 17, only now it is being ridden by a woman, and in response to the seer's incomprehension an *angelus interpretis* informs him that the seven heads of the beast are seven hills and also seven rulers. There can

---

G. REESE, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums*. Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4Esrabuches (BBB 123; Berlin 1999) 70, n. 1.

<sup>(55)</sup> We follow the alternate translation offered by J. PRIEST, "Testament of Moses", *OTP* 1, 930, n. 3.

<sup>(56)</sup> Cf. COLLINS, "Kingdom", 90.

<sup>(57)</sup> Cf. C. CLEMENT, "Die Himmelfahrt Moses", *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed. E. KAUTZSCH) (Reprint: Darmstadt 1975 [1900]) 327, n. n. Contra REESE, *Geschichte*, 89-90.

be little doubt that this is a reference to the well-known Roman imperial motif of the goddess Roma sitting on the seven hills of Rome. Thus, the intratextual and intertextual allusions in the book of Revelation make it abundantly clear that author identifies the beast with the fourth kingdom of Daniel on the one hand and with Rome on the other.

- c. Josephus picks up the story of Daniel in Book 10 of his *Antiquities*. He relates Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezer's dream quite extensively in *Ant.* 10.203-210, explaining that the second kingdom represents two kings who will destroy Nebuchadnezer's kingdom (Darius and Cyrus). Their kingdom will be overrun by that of a ruler from the West (Alexander), and his kingdom will in turn be destroyed by the fourth kingdom which, Josephus notes, is represented by iron. It becomes sufficiently clear that he associates Rome with this fourth kingdom when we juxtapose this text with Josephus' account of the vision of the ram and the male goat of Dan 8 in *Ant.* 10:269-276. There Josephus outlines the succession of kingdoms as we have iterated them above, referring explicitly to the Medes, Persians, Greeks, and Antiochus Epiphanes IV. This is followed by the statement that "in the same manner Daniel also wrote about the Roman government, namely, that [our country] would be destroyed by them" (*Ant.* 10:276b). Now Antiochus Epiphanes IV is the end of the story as far as Dan 8 is concerned, so if Josephus is convinced that Daniel had, in fact, prophesied about Rome, particularly that Judea would be destroyed by Rome, it is clear that this notion could only have been generated by Josephus' reading of Dan 2 and 7. Josephus' reluctance to explicitly identify Rome with Daniel's fourth kingdom is understandable, given that this kingdom, as well, will be destroyed by God's eternal kingdom. That is not a message that would have sat well with Josephus' Flavian benefactors, and it is not surprising that he consistently suppresses this part of the prophecy.
- d. Fourth Ezra's famous vision of an eagle coming up out of the sea (4 *Ezra* 11) could hardly have alluded more clearly to Rome. While opinions differ as to the identity of the various referents in this allegorical text (mostly as a function of the dating of the vision)<sup>(58)</sup>, Stone is surely right when he states that "[t]he central point in any

<sup>(58)</sup> I accept the standard dating of 4 Ezra in the waning years of the first century C.E.

study of the symbolism and its interpretation is the identification of the three heads”<sup>(59)</sup>. The majority opinion holds that the details best fit the Flavian emperors, a claim the preponderance of evidence would seem to support. In any case, all are agreed that some constellation of Roman emperors is in view. In *4 Ezra* 12 Ezra prays for an interpretation of the vision. God acquiesces to Ezra’s request and states unequivocally that “the eagle which you saw coming up from the sea is the fourth kingdom which appeared in a vision to your brother Daniel” (*4 Ezra* 12:11).

## 2. *Daniel’s Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (Dan 9)*

Dan 9 is set in the first year of the reign of Darius and relates how Daniel was meditating on Jeremiah’s prophecy that Israel would spend seventy years in exile (cf. Dan 9,2 with Jer 29,10). In the lengthy prayer that follows (Dan 9,4-19), Daniel’s yearning for the end of exile is palpable, and it is clear that he believes the prophesied seventy years must be nearing their completion. As Daniel prays, however, the angel Gabriel appears to him and reveals to him that the seventy years are to be understood as seventy weeks of years (Dan 9,24); in other words, 490 years. Perhaps no other single prophecy so captured the minds of Jews in the late Second Temple period as this one. It is clear that Josephus has this text in mind when he expresses his opinion that Daniel is in a league of his own when it comes to prophecy because, unlike other prophets who merely prophesy what events will occur in some indefinite future, Daniel also states when these events will occur (*Ant.* 10:267b). The fact that the number 490 carries such symbolic weight ( $490 = 49 \times 10$ ; i.e. ten jubilee periods) certainly prompted greater interest in the prophecy. In any case, the impact of Daniel’s prophecy was profound. As R. Beckwith so cogently states,

There is strong evidence to show that the Essenes, the Pharisees and the Zealots all thought that they could date, at least approximately, the time when the Son of David would come, and that in each case their calculations were based upon Daniel’s prophecy of the 70 Weeks (Dan 9:24-27), understood as 70 weeks of years<sup>(60)</sup>.

<sup>(59)</sup> M. E. STONE, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 1990) 363-365.

<sup>(60)</sup> R.T. BECKWITH, “The Year of the Messiah: Jewish and Early Christian Chronologies, and their Eschatological Consequences”, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian*. Biblical, Intertestamental and Patristic Studies (Leiden 1996) 217.

All this has been carefully documented by Beckwith and others, so we will only review a few of the most salient examples of the illustrious *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Dan 9,24-27:

- a. 11Q13 (11QM<sup>elch</sup>) reveals the strong tendency toward the periodization of history into ten Jubilee periods and clearly alludes to Dan 9,24 in lines 6-7: "And liberty will be proclaimed for them...in the first week of the jubilee which follows the nine jubilees. And the Day of Atonement is the end of the tenth jubilee..."
- b. 4Q390 (4Qps<sup>Moses</sup>) describes the return from exile, lamenting that the returnees did evil in the Lord's eyes, except for those who built the temple. The author then explains that "in the seventh jubilee of the devastation of the land they will forget the law, the festival, the Sabbath, and the covenant; and they will disobey everything and will do what is evil in my eyes...and there will come the dominion of Belial upon them to deliver them up to the sword for a week of years..." (4Q390 I,7-9; II,3-4). This obvious allusion to the period of Hellenization in the early second century B.C.E., and the tumultuous reign of Antiochus Epiphanes IV is assigned to the seventh Jubilee period.
- c. The Testament of Levi is even more detailed. In *T. Levi* 11 the author explicitly divides Daniel's seventy weeks into ten Jubilee periods. As in 4Q390, the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes IV is assigned to the seventh Jubilee period. *T. Levi* 17,10 places the rededication of the temple in the fifth week of the seventh Jubilee period, and we know that that event took place in 164 B.C.E. Following this timetable, the author would have placed the end of the seventy weeks at approximately 4 B.C.
- d. After describing the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in great detail in Book 5 of his *Bellum judaicum*, Josephus tries to explain to his Roman audience why the Jews pursued their manifestly foolhardy strategy of war with Rome to the bitter end. What spurned them on the most, according to Josephus, was an "ambiguous oracle" (χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος)<sup>(61)</sup> in their holy writings that "at that time someone from their own country would rule the world" (*J.W.* 6:312: ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνων ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν τις ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης). The fact that the oracle

<sup>(61)</sup> The oracle is ambiguous, as far as Josephus is concerned, because it really pointed to Vespasian, not some Jewish messiah (*J.W.* 6:313). It is doubtful that many Jews shared that view.

concerned the time at which the world ruler would appear together with Josephus' statement noted above that Daniel alone among the prophets gave indication as to when the events he prophesied would occur make it virtually certain that he had Dan 9,24-27 in mind.

These references support Beckwith's contention, referred to above, that in the late Second Temple period Jews of various ideological bents attempted to calculate the time of the appearance of the Messiah based on their reading of Dan 9,24-27. The well-documented heightening of messianic expectation during that period clearly shows that, although they might have quibbled with each other about the details of the timing, all expected that the end of the age would soon be upon them.

### 3. *The Abomination of Desolation (Dan 9,27; 11,31; 12,11)*

Gabriel's revelation to Daniel concerning the seventy weeks of years ends with the announcement that the temple cult will cease during the final week, and an "abomination of desolation", as the term has been traditionally rendered (LXX: βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων), will be set up in its place (Dan 9,26-27). The same phrase is repeated in 11,31 and 12,11, and on all three occasions the abomination of desolation is closely connected to the cessation of sacrifice in the temple. It is therefore likely that in each case the referent is the same. My concern, however, is not to determine what the phrase referred to in its original context but, once again, to assess its *Wirkungsgeschichte* in early Judaism<sup>(62)</sup>.

- a. The author of 1 Maccabees explicitly associates the abomination of desolation with the desecration of the Temple carried out by Antiochus Epiphanes IV in 167 B.C.E. Cf. 1 Macc 1,54: "Now on the fifteenth day of Chislev, in the one hundred forty-fifth year, they erected a desolating sacrilege [βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως] on the altar of burnt offering".
- b. The Synoptic Gospels ascribe to Jesus a warning in the eschatological discourse that "when you see the abomination of desolation (both Matthew and Mark have τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως; Matt 24,15; Mark 13,14) standing in the holy place (Mark: "where it ought not to be"), then those in Judea must flee to the hills". While skepticism about the attribution of this logion to Jesus remains strong in some scholarly circles, first century Jewish Christians in Jerusalem seemed to have entertained no doubts as to its prophetic

(62) On which, cf. D. WENHAM, "Abomination of Desolation", *ABD* I, 28-31.



veracity. They understood the statement as a reference to Daniel's prophecy (this is, of course, explicit in Matthew), which they believed had yet to be fulfilled. According to Luke, whose handling of the material is quite different from that of Matthew and Mark (Luke 21,20-21), this would happen when armies surrounded Jerusalem. Writing when he did, either immediately before or in the aftermath of the fall of Jerusalem, there can be no question that Luke understood these armies to be Vespasian's legions.

- c. Eusebius relates in his account of the fall of Jerusalem that "the people of the church in Jerusalem had been commanded by a revelation, vouchsafed to approved men there before the war, to leave the city and to dwell in a certain town of Perea called Pella" (*Hist. eccl.* 3.5.3). While it cannot be definitively proven that the revelation he mentions is identical with the synoptic logion, Eusebius' account does, at the very least, presuppose the presence of an authoritative tradition in the Jerusalem church on the basis of which a directive to leave the city would have been taken seriously.

This brief look at the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of three prophetic traditions from the book of Daniel shows how profound their influence was on the eschatological conceptions of Jews in the late Second Temple period. This should remind us that the contemporaries of Jesus and Paul did not cut a new eschatological narrative out of whole cloth. One was already firmly in place, and it should not be confused with the often apolitical eschatological conceptions of modern Western Christianity. First-century Jews believed they were living during the time of Daniel's fourth kingdom, which they identified with Rome. They eagerly awaited the end of Rome's hegemony and its replacement by God's eternal kingdom and were convinced that the time allotted by God for Daniel's fourth kingdom was drawing to its conclusion. The followers of Jesus cherished a prophetic logion they believed to be from him, warning them to beware of a future manifestation of the "abomination of desolation", understood as the desecration of the Temple, and they observed Rome's encroachment on Jerusalem with wary eyes accordingly.

### III. Evidence of Danielic Eschatological Concepts in Paul

All of this is, of course, generally known. Various Third-Questers have raised our awareness of the Jewish apocalyptic flavor of late Second Temple eschatological concepts, and many long-held tenets of

New Testament theology have been or are being reexamined as a result. The current interest in Paul's political theology owes its impetus, at least in part, to these developments, and it is most certainly to be welcomed. It has not, however, always been appreciated that these concepts directly and profoundly influenced Paul's own eschatology<sup>(63)</sup>. In fact, the latter shows evidence of several points of contact with Daniel's historical narrative. These are outlined below.

### 1. Paul's "Kingdom" Language in 1 Cor 15,24-28

While most of Paul's references to the "kingdom of God" or the "kingdom of Christ" are too fleeting to allow for a sustained *traditions-geschichtliche* analysis<sup>(64)</sup> Paul's use of the concept in 1 Cor 15,24-28 has been subject of fruitful study in this regard. Almost all scholars recognize that Paul is drawing on Jewish apocalyptic traditions here. Conzelmann traces Paul's notion "daß der Weltlauf einem vorbestimmten Plan folgt" to the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 En.* 91-93) and *Sib. Or.* 4:47-91<sup>(65)</sup>, but it is, I believe, possible to trace these apocalyptic roots further back. Raymond Collins perceptively notes the presence of four apocalyptic motifs in 1 Cor 15,20-28: "the predetermined order, the presence of evil powers, the end time confrontation, [and] the victory of God's designated agent"<sup>(66)</sup>. It is readily apparent that all four are integral components of Daniel's four kingdom scheme.

Further, although the heart of Paul's argument here involves a *gezerah shawah* interpretation of Ps 8,7 and Ps 110,1, certain

<sup>(63)</sup> Cf. e.g. N.T. WRIGHT, *Paul*. In *Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis, MN 2005) 53, who claims that Paul "eschewed" Daniel's four kingdom scheme. This is a judgment based on an argument from silence, and a rather heavy-handed one at that, from someone usually quite attuned to myriad OT "echoes", some of which are arguably much fainter.

<sup>(64)</sup> The term βασιλεία occurs in conjunction with the subjective genitive θεου in Rom 14,17; 1 Cor 4,20; 6,9; 15,50; Gal 5,21; Eph 5,5; Col 4,11; 1 Thess 2,12 (here ἑαυτοῦ with reference to God), and 2 Thess 1,5; twice in conjunction with the subjective genitive Χριστοῦ in Eph 5,5 or ὑποῦ in Col 1,13, and twice with the subjective genitive αὐτοῦ where the reference is ambiguous and may refer either to God or Christ in 2 Tim 4,1.18. The use of βασιλεία without any modification by a subjective genitive in 1 Cor 15,24 is unique within the Pauline corpus. For our purposes, it is unnecessary to decide which of these references should be considered truly Pauline.

<sup>(65)</sup> H. CONZELMANN, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK 5; Göttingen 1981) 329.

<sup>(66)</sup> R.F. COLLINS, *First Corinthians* (SacPag 7; Collegeville, PA 1999) 549.

assumptions he makes are inexplicable on the basis of those texts alone. I would argue that at least two of them are traceable exclusively to Dan 7. One is the eternal subordination of the Son, which neither Ps 8 nor Ps 110 demand, especially when they are read in such a blatantly Christological manner. Indeed, they might more naturally be taken to imply parity between the Father and the Son. It is, on the other hand, comparatively easy to see how the idea of subordination could be inferred from the approach of the one like the Son of Man to the throne of the Ancient of Days in Dan 7,13. The other assumption Paul makes might be termed, for want of a better word, the “transferability” of the kingdom. This lies at the heart of what is going on in Dan 7. The “everlasting kingdom” intriguingly changes hands a couple of times within the narrative (from God to the Son of Man to the saints and back), and it is not always easy to follow “whose” the kingdom is at any given moment (Dan 7,14.21.27). Perhaps this accounts for the (uncharacteristically Pauline) absolute use of βασιλεία of in 1 Cor 15,24 noted above (cf. n. 64). In any case, the theology 1 Corinthians evokes this very dynamic: God’s reign is currently being challenged by the rulers of this world (1 Cor 2,8), but the saints will reign with Christ (1 Cor 4,8) until all authority and power have been subjugated to him and the last enemy has been defeated (1 Cor 15,24-25), at which time the Son will give over the kingdom to God (1 Cor 15,28).

## 2. Paul’s Expectation that the Saints will Judge the World

In 1 Cor 6,2, Paul rebukes the Corinthian Christians for suing each other in Roman law courts. Using an *a maiore ad minus* rhetorical strategy, he reminds them that they should be able to deal with such conflicts within the church, since “the saints will judge the world” (οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσιν). The way he introduces this assertion, “don’t you know...” (οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι...) makes it clear that Paul assumed the Corinthians would, in fact, be familiar with this tenant, possibly because he had expounded on the subject during his one and a half year sojourn in Corinth<sup>(67)</sup>. Though there have been some dissenting voices<sup>(68)</sup>, the majority of scholars believe that Paul is

<sup>(67)</sup> This necessitates in itself, however, neither the view of CONZELMANN, *Korinther*, 133, that the teaching was a “Lehrstück des urchristlichen Katechismus”, nor that of S. KIM, “Jesus, Sayings of”, *DPL*, 482, that the formula indicates teachings of Jesus that Paul personally conveyed to the Corinthian church.

<sup>(68)</sup> Cf. A. C. THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2000) 425-427.

alluding to a widespread apocalyptic tradition concerning the role of the elect in the eschaton<sup>(69)</sup>. This tradition has its roots in a straightforward reading of Dan 7,22 that “[the Ancient of days] gave judgment to the saints of the Most High” (τὴν κρίσιν ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ ὑψίστου)<sup>(70)</sup>. The breadth of attestation for this tradition in early Jewish literature and the off-handed manner in which Paul refers to it constitute strong evidence that this Danielic concept, and thus the narrative of Dan 7, help shaped Paul’s *Heilsgeschichte*.

### 3. Paul’s Notion that the Present Age has Almost Run its Course

Several texts make it clear that Paul shared the belief of his Jewish contemporaries that the *heilsgeschichtliche* period they were living in was the penultimate one (i.e. Daniel’s fourth kingdom) and that it would soon be followed by the consummation of God’s eternal reign. We cannot examine each of these in depth, and since I have offered similar analysis elsewhere<sup>(71)</sup> I will only briefly review the evidence here.

#### a) 1 Cor 7,29-31

In the pericope preceding 1 Cor 7,29-31 Paul argues that there is no cause for undue concern about one’s station in life, whether one is married or unmarried, circumcised or uncircumcised, slave or free. In

<sup>(69)</sup> Cf. e.g. G.D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 233; W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1,1-6,11)* (EKK VII/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991) 410; E.J. SCHNABEL, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (HTA; Wuppertal 2007) 307.

<sup>(70)</sup> Cf. C.H. DODD, *According to the Scriptures*. The Substructure of New Testament Theology (London 1952) 68; B.S. ROSNER, *Paul Scripture, and Ethics*. A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7 (Grand Rapids, MI 1994) 111. The provenance of the tradition concerning the judgment of angels in v. 3 (ἁγγέλους κρινοῦμεν) is less clear.

<sup>(71)</sup> WHITE, *Erstlingsgabe*, 143-156. There I argued that Paul’s attitude with regard to the timing of the Parousia may be best described not as an “akute Naherwartung” — so U. SCHNELLE, *Paulus: Leben und Denken* (Berlin 2003) 673 — but as a “kontingente Naherwartung”. By that I meant (and I do not intend to argue otherwise here) that Paul did not believe that the Parousia must necessarily occur “soon” (i.e. during his lifetime), although he certainly did not rule out that possibility. Instead, he expected the Parousia to take place immediately after those events that signaled the end of the present age. He clearly thought that these events were “near” (i.e., they would occur next in God’s fore-ordained *Heilsgeschichte*) and therefore that he was living in temporal proximity to the end of the present age.

our text he explains why this is the case. For our purposes, the thematic inclusio that frames the explanation is of greatest interest. In v. 29 Paul states that “the critical time has been shortened” (ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν)<sup>(72)</sup>. The wording is somewhat unusual, but it seems clear that Paul is trying to convey the idea that the present age will soon run up against its divinely ordained temporal limit. V. 31 serves to reinforce the point: The values and norms operable in the present age, including those embodied by societal preferences for one station above another, are fast losing all significance because “the form of this world is passing away” (παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου). Paul’s point, as Schrage so poetically puts it, is not so much the imminence of the “Weltende”, but rather that of a “Weltwende”<sup>(73)</sup> by means of which this age will give way to a new one. This new age will be completely different from all that came before and will therefore require an entirely different set of values and norms. Paul clearly believes he is living in temporal proximity to the tipping point between these ages.

#### b) Rom 13,11-12a

The same perspective is evident in Rom 13,11-12a. As is 1 Cor 7,29-31 Paul enjoins a certain ethical stance based on his assessment, one that he obviously believes will be self-evident to the Christians in Rome, of their position near the end of the eschatological time line<sup>(74)</sup>. Paul uses two related metaphors to express his point. The first one, found in v. 11, is that of waking up on time, for “the hour has already come to arise from sleep” (ὥρα ἤδη ὑμᾶς ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι). The second metaphor in v. 12a is that of a night nearly over and the dawn of a new day close at hand: “The night is well advanced, and the day is near” (ἡ νὺξ προέκοπεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν). Both metaphors are full of eschatological connotations that would have been very apparent to Paul’s readers<sup>(75)</sup>. By referring to the “hour” in v. 11, Paul may even be consciously alluding to Daniel, who often uses the term with a sense of

<sup>(72)</sup> On this translation cf. THISELTON, *Corinthians*, 580-583; SCHNABEL, *Korinther*, 407.

<sup>(73)</sup> W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1Kor 6,12-11,16)* (EKK VII/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1995) 176-177.

<sup>(74)</sup> I regard the participial phrase καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν as anaphoric, referring to the ethical injunctions in the preceding section. Cf. D. MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 819-820.

<sup>(75)</sup> J.D.G. DUNN, *Romans 9-16* (WBC 38B; Dallas, TX 1988) 785-788.

eschatological urgency (Dan 8,17.19; 11,35)<sup>(76)</sup>. With regard to the second metaphor in v. 12a, few doubt that Paul has a very specific “day” in mind: the “day of the Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor 1,8) which in Paul’s thinking denoted the demarcation point between the end of the present age and the final establishment of God’s reign in Christ<sup>(77)</sup>. Paul is thus traversing familiar early Christian terrain in referring to the nearness of the Parousia of Christ (Phil 4,5; Jas 5,8; 1 Pet 4,7).

c) Rom 16,20a

There has been some discussion as to whether Paul’s hortatory remark in Rom 16,20a “The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet” (ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης συντρίψει τὸν σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει) refers to the final eschatological triumph over Satan or simply to the defeat of the false teachers in Rome, against whom Paul’s words in the section immediately preceding this verse are directed. The similarity of this statement to ones in various roughly contemporary Jewish texts that predict the downfall of the demonic realm (*Jub.* 23,29; *1 En.* 10,4; 13,1-2; *2 En.* 7,1-3; *T. Mos.* 10,1; *T. Levi* 18,12; *T. Sim.* 6,6; 1QM XVII,5; XVIII,1) would seem to indicate that the former view is more likely correct, but perhaps Schreiner is right when he argues that the two views need not be considered mutually exclusive<sup>(78)</sup>. Indeed, there is ample evidence across a broad spectrum of early Jewish and Christian literature that the emergence of false teachers was regarded as one of the sure signs that the end of the present age was near (*Jub.* 23,14-21; *4 Esra* 5,1; *1 En.* 91,3-8; 93,8-10; 1 Tim 4,1-2; 2 Tim 3,1; 2 Pet 3,3; 1 John 2,18). If that is true, then Rom

<sup>(76)</sup> This does not, in and of itself, indicate subversive intent on Paul’s part. Danielic concepts seem to be behind Paul’s positive view of the state in Rom 13,1-7 (see above), especially his statement in Rom 13,1b that there is no governing authority that does not ultimately originate with God and that the existing authorities have been appointed by God (cf. Dan 2,21; 4,17.25.32; 5,2). So also Dunn, *Romans* 9-16, 770-771. These, in turn, are rooted in OT and early Jewish convictions regarding the divine origin of human government — cf. U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK VI/3, Röm 12-16; Zürich 1982) 33. It should not be forgotten, however, that Paul’s view of the state cannot be articulated on the basis of Rom 13,1-7 alone. Other passages such as 1 Cor 2,8; 6,1-8 and, indeed, the texts under consideration here make it clear that, while Paul affirmed the state as part of the God-given order for the present age, it is far from being inherently good and trustworthy, and should thus to be assessed critically. Cf. O. CULLMANN, *Der Staat im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen 1956) 36-50.

<sup>(77)</sup> Cf. MOO, *Romans*, 821, n. 20.

<sup>(78)</sup> Cf. T. SCHREINER, *Romans* (ECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 804-805.

16,20a serves as one more indication that Paul viewed the present age of *Heilsgeschichte* as having almost exhausted itself.

Other texts from the disputed Pauline epistles could be mustered, but these suffice to show that Paul understood himself to be living near the end of the present age. The imminent return of Christ would bring to an end the current age and usher in the eschaton. As we saw, this conviction is based, above all, on the early Jewish understanding of Daniel's prophecies.

#### 4. *Paul's Allusion to Danielic Traditions in 2 Thess 2,3-4*

The authorship of 2 Thessalonians continues to be a much-debated topic, but it must now be acknowledged that no small number of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic regard the letter as authentic<sup>(79)</sup>. One reason for the willingness to reconsider a question many regarded as settled by the studies of Wrede<sup>(80)</sup> and Trilling<sup>(81)</sup> is, perhaps, precisely the apocalyptic flavor of this section of the letter. This was seen as a clear contra-indication of Pauline authorship by an earlier generation of scholars, but the new appreciation for the thoroughly Jewish apocalyptic nature of Paul's theology has led many to move this argument to the "pro" side of the tally board. I have argued elsewhere that the other major arguments are not strong enough to preclude

<sup>(79)</sup> Cf. W.G. KÜMMEL, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Heidelberg 201980) 228-232; F.F. BRUCE, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC; Waco, TX 1982) xxxii-xxxiii; R. JEWETT, *The Thessalonian Correspondence. Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* (Philadelphia, PA 1986) 3-18: "probably Pauline"; C. A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 17-28; J.D.G. DUNN, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 13, n. 39; J.C. HURD, "Concerning the Authenticity of 2 Thessalonians", *The Earlier Letters of Paul and Other Studies* (Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums 8; Frankfurt 1998) 135-161; P. STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen 1999) II, 54-59; A. MALHERBE, *The Letters to the Thessalonians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32B; New York 2000) 350-375; C.R. NICOLL, *From Hope to Despair in Thessalonica. Situating 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (MSSNTS 126; Cambridge 2004) 198-221; K.-W. NIEBUHR, "Die Paulusbriefsammlung", *Grundinformation Neues Testament. Eine bibelkundlich-theologische Einführung* (UTB 2108; Göttingen 2000) 275-276; B. REICKE, *Re-examining Paul's Letters. The History of the Pauline Correspondence* (Harrisburg, PA 2001) 39-41; U. WILCKENS, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2005) I.3, 66.

<sup>(80)</sup> Cf. W. WREDE, *Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefes* (TU 24; Leipzig 1903).

<sup>(81)</sup> W. TRILLING, *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Thessalonicherbrief* (EthSt; Leipzig 1972).

giving 2 Thessalonians the benefit of the doubt in favor of Pauline authorship<sup>(82)</sup>, though with Ernest Best I would want to “widen the concept of authenticity to include authorship by a companion of Paul writing at his behest (and not one of his companions or someone from a ‘Pauline’ school writing after his death)”<sup>(83)</sup>.

The *Traditionsgeschichte* behind 2 Thess 2,3-4 is complex, and we will not examine it thoroughly here. It is sufficient for our purposes to note that several strains of thought running through this text have antecedents in Daniel. First, we note the idea of an end-time apostasy instigated by a “man of lawlessness” in v. 3. This seems to be a clear allusion to the “little horn” of Dan 7,8 and 8,9 that is revealed to be a ruler who “intends to change times and the law” (Dan 7,25) and is further described by Gabriel as a future king who understands “sinister schemes” (Dan 8,23) and who “by his cunning shall cause deceit to prosper under his rule” (Dan 8,25). Second, Paul states that this man of lawlessness will “oppose and exalt himself over everything that is called God or is worshipped” and “claim to be God” (2 Thess 2,3). This is evocative of the description of the lawless ruler of Daniel who will “speak pompous words against the Most High” (Dan 7,25), “exalt himself as high as the Prince of the Host” (Dan 8,25), and “regard neither the God of his fathers...nor any god, for he shall exalt himself above them all” (Dan 11,37). Third, though Paul does not use the phrase “abomination of desolation”, he does mention that the man of lawlessness will “seat himself in the temple of God” (2 Thess 2,3), which is reminiscent of the tradition concerning the cessation of sacrifice and the setting up of the “abomination of desolation” attested in Dan 9,27; 11,31; 12,11 (see above). Fourth, the notion that the lawless one’s great power is derived from Satan (2 Thess 2,9) may allude to the statement in Dan 8,24 that “his power shall be mighty, but it will not be his own power”. It is perhaps possible to identify other allusions to Daniel in the larger context, but these suffice to highlight

<sup>(82)</sup> WHITE, *Erstlingsgabe*, 217-222.

<sup>(83)</sup> E. BEST, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (BNTC; London 1986) 52-53. So also T. HOLTZ, “Thessalonicherbriefe”, TRE XXXIII, 420; D. DESILVA, *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Contexts, Methods, and Ministry Formation (Downers Grove, IL 2004) 542. The evidence of 2 Thess would still deserve consideration even if the letter is deemed to be “Pauline” only in the broader sense that Best rightly excludes from the notion of authorship — on which cf. A.D. BAUM, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum* (WUNT 2/138; Tübingen 2001) 92-93 — but its weight for the purposes of my argument would be lessened considerably.



the impressive parallels that exist between 2 Thess 2,3-4 and various Danielic motifs.

\*  
\* \*

In this article, I have tried to show that the proponents of an “anti-imperial Paul” have not convincingly established the existence of subversive subtexts in his letters. Specifically, they have not been able to show that Paul’s Christology was consciously formulated with the intent of subverting Rome’s authority and power. Nevertheless, the subversive quality of Paul’s Gospel can hardly be denied, and I have endeavored to prove that this is rooted in his Jewish-apocalyptic, more specifically Danielic, conception of history. Daniel was well-known and broadly accepted by Jews in the Second Temple period, not least among them Paul, who demonstrates familiarity with this narrative and implicitly affirms it at several points. This is one clear area of continuity between first-century Judaism and the Apostle or, to put it another way, between the pre-Damascus Saul and the post-Damascus Paul. While the standard Jewish apocalyptic framework was thoroughly modified by the Apostle to account for the central place he came to assign Christ in God’s plan of salvation, its basic structure remained essentially the same. Specifically, Paul shared the view of his Jewish contemporaries that the entire world order of that day, which was dominated by Rome in nearly all facets of life, represented the penultimate stage of *Heilsgeschichte*. Rome was Daniel’s fourth kingdom, and at the impending Parousia of the Messiah Jesus the Roman world order would be destroyed (1 Cor 2,6). It was, in fact, already in the process of disappearing from the stage (1 Cor 7,31). The final act of *Heilsgeschichte*, a decidedly non-Roman one, was already breaking upon the scene.

Freie Theologische Hochschule Giessen  
Rathenaustrasse 5-7  
D-35394 Giessen, Germany

Joel WHITE

#### SUMMARY

This article argues that, though it cannot be doubted that there is a subversive quality to Paul’s letters, attempts to identify subversive subtexts have failed due to their preoccupation with what is deemed inherently subversive vocabulary. A better approach to grounding Paul’s anti-imperial theology is to recognize that he affirmed the subversive late Second temple Jewish-apocalyptic, and particularly Danielic, narrative that viewed Rome as final earthly kingdom that will be destroyed by the coming of God’s kingdom.

## Artemis and Asiarchs Some Remarks on Ephesian Local Colour in Acts 19(\*)

It has become quite common in the exegesis of Acts to point to the particularly strong local colour in chapter 19, where Luke recounts Paul's stay in Ephesos, and to acknowledge that Luke is remarkably well informed about this city<sup>(1)</sup>. Whether this strong local colour makes Acts 19 a reliable historical source for the narrated period is, however, a different matter. The objective of this contribution is, after some general reflections on Acts 19 as a historical source, to illustrate these with regard to two examples: the asiarchs (Acts 19,31) and Ephesos as "temple-warden" (νεωκόρος) of Artemis (19,35).

### 1. Acts 19 as a Source

To put the matter concisely: Does the narrative of Acts 19 report what really happened in the mid-50s of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, when Paul was in Ephesos? This seems to be the most natural reading of the narrative<sup>(2)</sup>. The many local details in this chapter can, then, be seen as

(\*) This contribution has a long pre-history. Research on this topic has been a by-product of my doctoral dissertation, and it has been further informed by my teaching at the University of Cambridge (Faculty of Divinity). Thanks are due to my colleague Dr. Simon Gathercole for improving the English.

(<sup>1</sup>) It may suffice to mention A.N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. The Sarum Lectures 1960-1961 (Oxford 1963) 83-92; P. LAMPE, "Acta 19 im Spiegel der ephesischen Inschriften", *BZ.NF* 36 (1992) 59-76; W. THIESSEN, *Christen in Ephesus*. Die historische und theologische Situation in vorpaulinischer und paulinischer Zeit und zur Zeit der Apostelgeschichte und der Pastoralbriefe (TANZ 12; Tübingen – Basel 1995) 107-108, 234-235; R. SELINGER, "Die Demetriosunruhen (Apg. 19,23-40). Eine Fallstudie aus rechtshistorischer Perspektive", *ZNW* 88 (1997) 242-259, esp. 259; P. TREBILCO, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (WUNT 166; Tübingen 2004) 104-107. Historical work on ancient Ephesos is greatly facilitated by the handy corpus of inscriptions: *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* (eds. C. BÖRKER et al.) (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 11/1-8; Bonn 1979-1984) I-VIII, hereafter "IvE".

(<sup>2</sup>) Most recently: A. WEISS, "Der Aufruhr der Silberschmiede (Apg 19,23-40) und das Edikt des Paullus Fabius Persicus (I. Ephesos 17-19)", *BZ.NF* 53 (2009) 69-81, esp. 72,81. However, Weiss is aware that his reconstruction of events is only valid if Acts 19,23-40 is a reliable account of what really happened. He

an indication of reliable sources that Luke could use — and thus of the historical reliability of his account<sup>(3)</sup> This approach no doubt yields many fascinating findings, and, in fact, many elements of Acts 19 can be correlated to information provided by the impressive corpus of inscriptions, which allows us to appreciate Luke as a very well informed author. But is it really possible to go one step further and declare these details to be authentic information from Paul's time?

Back in the 1970s, Hans Conzelmann has denounced this as a short circuit and set up what became known as his "Karl May rule": Local detail or direct speech does not prove anything with regard to the historicity of the narrated event<sup>(4)</sup>. With minor stylistic variations, this rule has been a constant element of the *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament*, from the 1<sup>st</sup> edition in 1975 to the 14<sup>th</sup> edition in 2004<sup>(5)</sup>. It even found benevolent reception outside the academic discipline of New Testament Exegesis<sup>(6)</sup>. The reasoning behind this rule is spelt out in greater detail in a fairly harsh book review from 1976, where Conzelmann moved from criticising a certain book to more general considerations:

"Ein Problem der Methode: Angelsächsische Forscher haben hervorragende Arbeit in der Erforschung der Schauplätze geleistet, auf denen die Handlung der AG spielt. Nun wird gern der Schluß gezogen: Ist das Milieu (z.B. das damalige Athen) getreu geschildert, dann ist auch der Bericht über die Ereignisse zuverlässig. Nun, gerade das ist die Frage: Mit jenem Schluß läßt sich schließlich auch die Geschichtlichkeit der Erzählungen von Karl May beweisen"<sup>(7)</sup>.

---

suggests that the tumult reported in Acts 19,23-40 is due to an over-sensitivity towards any slander of Artemis, which in turn is due to the measures taken by the proconsul Paullus Fabius Persicus about a decade earlier to restore good order in the finances of the Artemision and the appointment of priests (see IvE 17-19).

<sup>(3)</sup> Cf. e.g. TREBILCO, *Early Christians*, 105-106. He points to a variation in designations for Artemis: In Acts 19,27 she is ἡ μεγάλη θεὰ Ἀρτεμις, whereas in 19,37 she is referred to as ἡ θεός. The same distinction (feminine form in conjunction with the proper name, masculine form without the proper name) is also found in the "Salutaris inscription" IvE 27 and thus, according to Trebilco, is "authentic Ephesian speech" (106).

<sup>(4)</sup> Cf. H. CONZELMANN – A. LINDEMANN, *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament* (UTB 52; Tübingen '1975) 41: "Eine genaue Milieuschilderung oder auch die breite Wiedergabe wörtlicher Rede beweist für die Geschichtlichkeit oder 'Richtigkeit' des erzählten Ereignisses überhaupt nichts".

<sup>(5)</sup> Cf. CONZELMANN – LINDEMANN, *Arbeitsbuch*<sup>1</sup>, 41; *Arbeitsbuch*<sup>14</sup>, 52.

<sup>(6)</sup> Cf. e.g. J. WEHNERT, "Die 'Karl-May-Regel' in der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft", *Mitteilungen der Karl-May-Gesellschaft* 16 (1984) 42.

<sup>(7)</sup> Review of W. GASQUE, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the*

In other words: Rich and precise local detail indicates only that a particular incident could have happened in the way it is narrated, it does not automatically prove that the event did happen in the way it is narrated; strictly spoken, local detail in itself does not even prove that the event happened at all.

To be sure, this rule has not gone unchallenged, especially with regard to the genre of Acts as a non-fictional text: Luke wrote about real, historical persons and about events that had really happened, so the argument runs, and therefore his work cannot be compared to and measured by the standards of a 19<sup>th</sup>-century novel<sup>(8)</sup>. However, the question of the genre and historical reliability of Acts cannot be reduced to the dichotomy “Fiction — Accurate report of facts”. Even if one does not consider Acts as an ancient novel<sup>(9)</sup> and if one grants that the subject of Acts are events in an identifiable past (which allows considering the book, at least in a broad sense, as a piece of historiography), this does not automatically make Acts a straightforward and “objective” account of “what really happened”. If nothing else, at least Luke’s selectivity in the account of Paul’s travels (no collection, no trouble with the Corinthians) indicates that he has a very particular agenda; numerous other elements could be added, such as the idealised presentation of the Jerusalem community in Acts 1–5. It seems, then, that the ἀσφάλεια promised in Luke 1,4 is not identical with historiographic objectivity and accuracy in a positivistic sense. To cut short what is a fairly complex, but by all means worthwhile discussion: It seems most appropriate to understand Acts as a piece of what may be called intentional or even constructive historiography, historiography that is meant to recall the memory of foundations and thus to shape the audience’s identity in their own time, to construct an image of the past that is meaningful and helpful for the present. In other words:

“Im Modus apologetischer Geschichtsschreibung zeichnet Lukas in der Apostelgeschichte das Gedächtnisbild des Urchristentums, genauer: ein bewegtes und bewegendes Gedächtnisgemälde von Herkunft und Anfang des Christentums. Er verankert die relationale

---

*Apostles* (BGBE 17; Tübingen 1975), *Erasmus* 28 (1976) 65–68, 67–68. Karl May (1842–1912), a German novelist, is famous for his novels set in the American West and in the Middle East — and for never having travelled to the places he so vividly describes.

<sup>(8)</sup> Cf. E.J. SCHNABEL, *Urchristliche Mission* (Wuppertal 2002) 26–27.

<sup>(9)</sup> Novelistic elements are pointed out by R.I. PERVO, *Profit with Delight*. The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia, PA 1987).

Erinnerung in der 'objektiven' Tiefe einer Erstepoche, um seiner Gemeinschaft auf einem lebhaften Forum konkurrierender religiöser Selbstdefinitionen die altbiblische Herkunft sichtbar zu machen, die Stiftungsmemoria zu vergegenwärtigen und so ihrer Gegenwart verbindliche Identität zu geben. Anders gesagt: Er entwirft die intentionale Geschichte der werdenden Kirche. Es ist diese Intentionalität, die seine Geschichtsschreibung als konstruktives Ordnungshandeln verstehen lässt" (10).

If this is a valid approach to Acts, then it becomes problematic to maintain a prejudice in favour of Acts as an *a priori* reliable historical source for the narrated events. On the other hand, to acknowledge that Luke had an agenda does not in itself justify a general verdict about Acts as historically worthless. Rather, as is often pointed out (11), the merits of historical details in Acts have to be judged individually — with the "Karl May rule" in mind. Moreover, when Acts is used as a historical source, some further clarification is required: Is the book used as a source for the events narrated, or is it used as a source for its author's convictions and concerns and for the challenges Luke and his readers/hearers probably faced? Are we interested in what happened in the first three decades of Christianity, or are we interested in how Luke told this story of the beginnings to an audience in his own time? Both approaches are worthwhile, but they should not be confused.

In the present contribution, these considerations will be further fleshed out with regard to two details in Acts 19.

## 2. The Asiarchs

In Acts 19,30-31 Luke interrupts his story of the silversmiths' revolt as the riotous crowd gathers in the theatre. Now the narrative focuses on Paul and his non-involvement in this riot. Apart from

(10) K. BACKHAUS, "Lukas der Maler: Die Apostelgeschichte als intentionale Geschichte der christlichen Erstepoche", K. BACKHAUS – G. HÄFNER, *Historiographie und fiktionales Erzählen. Zur Konstruktivität in Geschichtstheorie und Exegese* (BThSt 86; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2007) 30-66, 31 (the chapter's thesis); for materially similar (if differently nuanced) assessments cf. e.g. C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; London – New York 1998) II, cxi-cxii.cxvi-cxviii; S. SHAU, *Theology as History, History as Theology. Paul in Ephesus in Acts 19* (BZNW 133; Berlin – New York 2005) 299-317; D. MARGUERAT, *Les Actes des Apôtres (1-12)* (CNT 5a; Genève 2007) 26-27.

(11) Cf. e.g. J.A. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; New York 1998) 127; CONZELMANN – LINDEMANN, *Arbeitsbuch*<sup>14</sup>, 359.

fellow-Christians, “some of the asiarchs, being friends with him” (19,31) try to protect Paul from his own courage and to prevent him from appearing in the theatre. It is not entirely clear who these asiarchs were, and, particularly during the last two decades, there has been a heated controversy among historians. During the 1<sup>st</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> centuries CE, many notables in the province of Asia appear in the epigraphic (later also numismatic) record both as high priests of the provincial imperial cult and as asiarchs<sup>(12)</sup>. Most scholars conclude that “high priest of Asia” and “asiarch” were two designations for one and the same office with ἀσιάρχης as a convenient shorthand for ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας<sup>(13)</sup>. A

<sup>(12)</sup> For the epigraphic and numismatic record see S.J. FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*. Ephesos, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 116; Leiden, 1993) 172–184 (high priests), 185–188 (high priestesses), 189–208 (asiarchs). For some more recent additions see D. CAMPANILE, “Sommi sacerdoti, asiarchi e culto imperiale: Un aggiornamento”, *Studi Ellenistici* 19 (ed. B. VIRGILIO) (Studi Ellenistici 19; Pisa 2006) 523–584, 525–547.

<sup>(13)</sup> Cf. e.g. L. ROSS TAYLOR, “Note XXII. The Asiarchs”, *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. V. Additional Notes to the Commentary (eds. K. LAKE – H.J. CADBURY) (London 1933) 256–262; J. DEININGER, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Vestigia 6; München 1965) esp. 44–47; M. ROSSNER, “Asiarchen und Archiereis Asias”, *Studii Clasice* 16 (1974) 101–142; R. MERKELBACH, “Der Rangstreit der Städte Asiens und die Rede des Aelius Aristides über die Eintracht”, *ZPE* 32 (1978) 287–296; P. HERZ, “Asiarchen und Archiereiai. Zum Provinzialkult der Provinz Asia”, *Tyche* 7 (1992) 93–115; M. WÖRRLE, “Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi I”, *Chiron* 22 (1992) 337–376; M.D. CAMPANILE, *I sacerdoti del Koinon d'Asia (I sec. a.C. – III. sec. d.C.)*. Contributo allo studio della romanizzazione delle élites provinciali nell'Oriente greco (Studi Ellenistici 7; Pisa 1994); A. MEHL, “Asiarchie”, *Der Neue Pauly*. Enzyklopädie der Antike (eds. H. CANKI – H. SCHNEIDER) (Stuttgart – Weimar 1997) II, 80; ENGELMANN, “Asiarchs”, *ZPE* 132 (2000) 173–175; P. WEISS, “Asiarchen sind Archiereis Asias. Eine Antwort auf S.J. Friesen”, *Widerstand – Anpassung – Integration*. Die griechische Staatenwelt und Rom (eds. N. EHRHARDT – L.-M. GÜNTHER) (FS J. DEININGER) (Stuttgart 2002) 241–254; B. BURRELL, *Neokoroi*. Greek Cities and Roman Emperors (Cincinnati Classical Studies 9; Leiden – Boston 2004) 346–347; D. CAMPANILE, “Asiarchi e archiereis d'Asia: Titolatura, condizione giuridica e posizione sociale dei supremi dignitari del culto imperiale”, *Les cultes locaux dans les mondes grec et romain*. Actes du colloque de Lyon 7–8 Juin 2001 (ed. G. LABARRE) (Collection archéologie et histoire de l'antiquité. Université Lumière-Lyon 2. Volume VII; Lyon 2004) 69–79; M. CARTER, “Archiereis and Asiarchs. A Gladiatorial Perspective”, *GRBS* 44 (2004) 41–68; D. CAMPANILE, “Nuovi contributi dell'epigrafia per lo studio delle élites locali nelle provincie orientali in età romana: L'esempio dell'Asia”, *Le monde romain à travers l'épigraphie: Méthodes et pratiques*. Actes du XXIV<sup>e</sup> Colloque International de Lille (8–10 Novembre 2001) (eds. J. DESMULLIEZ – C.

minority, however, points to difficulties with the identification of high priests and asiarchs, and some would tentatively understand the asiarchs as municipal dignitaries<sup>(14)</sup>.

At this point some clarification may be in order: the imperial cult was normally not imposed by Roman rulers upon the provinces (Caligula is the notorious exception). The initiative came rather from the respective provincial assembly (in the province of Asia it was the κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας that represented the Greek cities in the province). This assembly applied, usually to the Senate, for permission to institute an imperial cult and to build a temple (cf. e.g. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4,15.37-38.55-56). For the population — especially the elites — of the provinces, this was a means of expressing their loyalty to the Roman emperor, but also of integrating this new rule with its unprecedented super-human power into their traditional conceptual world of the Greek city-state. The modern distinction between religion and politics is thus rather unhelpful for comprehending the phenomenon of the imperial cult<sup>(15)</sup>.

---

HOËT-VAN CAUWENBERGHE) (*Travaux et Recherches*; Lille 2005) 15-30; EAD., "Sommi sacerdoti", 548-550; F. KIRBIHLER, "Les grands-prêtres d'Éphèse: Aspects institutionnels et sociaux de l'asiarchie", *Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at Athens, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 19 december 2005* (eds. A.D. RIZAKIS – F. CAMIA) (Tripodes 6; Atene 2008) 107-149.

<sup>(14)</sup> Cf. C.G. BRANDIS, "Asiarches", *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (ed. G. WISSOWA) (Stuttgart 1896) II.2, 1564-1578; D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ* (Princeton 1950) II, 1300; R.A. KEARSLEY, "Asiarchs, Archiereis, and the Archiereiai of Asia", *GRBS* 27 (1986) 183-192; ID., "M. Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles of Aezani: Panhellene, Asiarch and Archiereus of Asia", *Antichthon* 21 (1987) 49-56; ID., "Some Asiarchs of Ephesos", *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1979* (ed. G.H.R. HORSLEY) (Macquarie University 1987) 46-55; EAD., "A Leading Family of Cibra and Some Asiarchs", *Anatolian Studies* 38 (1988) 43-51; ID., "Asiarchs: Titulature and Function. A Reappraisal", *Studii Clasice* 26 (1988) 57-65; ID., "Asiarchs, Archiereis and Archiereiai of Asia: New Evidence from Amorium in Phrygia", *Epigraphica Anatolica* 16 (1990) 69-80; FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 92-113; R.A. KEARSLEY, "The Asiarchs", *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* (eds. D.W.J. GILL – C. GEMPF) (Grand Rapids, MI – Carlisle 1994) II, 363-376; S.J. FRIESEN, "Asiarchs", *ZPE* 126 (1999) 275-290; ID., "Highpriests of Asia Minor and Asiarchs. Farewell to the Identification Theory", *Steine und Wege* (FS D. KNIBBE) (eds. P. SCHERRER – H. TAEUBNER – H. THÜR) (SÖAI 32; Wien 1999) 303-307; S. WITETSCHKE, "Paulus und die Asiarchen. App 19,31 im Streit der Historiker", *Gephyra* 2 (2005) 59-72, esp. 66-68.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. S.R.F. PRICE, *Rituals and Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984) esp. 234-248; H.-J. KLAUCK, *Die religiöse Umwelt des*

Coming back to the asiarchs, this contribution is certainly not the place for a detailed discussion of their office and identity. It may suffice here to mention a few points and to clarify the significance of Acts 19,31.

#### a) Attestation

Apart from Acts 19,31, asiarchs are attested in Strabon 14,1,42 (in the time of Augustus), where they are specified as οἱ πρωτεύοντες κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν. As Strabon asserts, there were always some people (τινές) from Tralleis who held this office. One recently published inscription, in which the inhabitants of two villages honour a certain Ti. Claudius Damas, an asiarch and Sebastophant, as “their saviour and benefactor”<sup>(16)</sup>, could be seen as evidence for an asiarch in the early principate, since the office of a Sebastophant requires a date after 29/27 BCE, when there was a cult of the Σεβαστός (Augustus) in the province of Asia. Apart from this, however it seems hardly possible to date this inscription with any certainty, because this asiarch “is otherwise unknown”<sup>(17)</sup>. We do know one Ti. Iulius Damas Claudianus, who was high priest of the provincial imperial cult in Ephesos in 90/91 CE (IvE 241), but it would be merely speculative to assume that the two are identical and that the name Claudianus (a reference to the emperor Tiberius’ *nomen gentile* before he was adopted by Augustus in 4 CE) has been dropped. The inscription features the full, traditional Roman name with the patronym and the *tribus* (which, by the way, argues for a rather early date), and since the inscription covers only about a fifth of the stone, there are no limitations of space that would have necessitated a compressed terminology.

---

*Urchristentums* (KStTh 9,2; Stuttgart 1996) II, 17-74; S.J. FRIESEN, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John*. Reading Revelation in the Ruins (Oxford – New York 2001) 122-131; S. WITETSCHKE, *Ephesische Enthüllungen 1*. Frühe Christen in einer antiken Großstadt. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach den Kontexten der Johannesapokalypse (Biblical Tools and Studies 6; Leuven – Paris – Dudley, MA 2008) 131-135.

<sup>(16)</sup> P. HERRMANN – H. MALAY, *New Documents from Lydia* (DÖAW.PH 340 – TAM Ergänzungsbände 24; Wien 2007) 96 (No. 68). The *nomen gentile* is a conjecture; on the stone there is a lacuna into which, according to the editors, [Ιούλι]ον fits better than [Κλαύδι]ον. The editors date this inscription to the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, but for D. CAMPANILE (“Sommi sacerdoti”, 532) the name Tiberius Iulius points rather to the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE.

<sup>(17)</sup> HERRMANN – MALAY, *New Documents*, 96.



On the whole, asiarchs are not very widely attested before the inauguration of the temple of the imperial cult in Ephesos in 89/90 CE<sup>(18)</sup> — the date is deduced from the dedicatory inscriptions in the temple of the Sebastoi in Ephesos (IvE 232; 232A; 233; 234; 235; 237; 238; 239; 240; 241; 242; 1498)<sup>(19)</sup>. Then the epigraphic record begins with one Tatianos in Ephesos (IvE 492) and remains consistently rich throughout the 2<sup>nd</sup> and far into the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE<sup>(20)</sup>. This remarkable shift in attestation suggests that in the late 1<sup>st</sup> century the office of asiarchs was revived and that these asiarchs were in some way associated with the imperial cult in the province of Asia — but this does not automatically make them high priests of this cult. On the other hand, of course, it would be quite natural to assume that the function of the asiarchs changed in the course of time, especially if the office was indeed revived after having been out of use for about a century<sup>(21)</sup>.

#### b) An Ephesian Example: Tiberius Claudius Aristion

Considering individual asiarchs demonstrates how ambiguous the evidence is. One of the most famous asiarchs is Ti. Claudius Aristion from Ephesos<sup>(22)</sup>. Pliny the Younger (Ep. 6,31,3) describes him as *princeps Ephesiorum, homo munificus et innoxie popularis*. In 88/89 CE he was the first high priest of Asia in charge of the temple of the Sebastoi in Ephesos (IvE 234; 235; 239; 1498). In 90/91 he was the first νεωκόπος (temple-warden) of the same temple (IvE 237; 241)<sup>(23)</sup>. In 92/93 he was both secretary (γραμματεὺς) and asiarch (IvE 461;

<sup>(18)</sup> The list of asiarchs in FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 189-208 begins with one Flavius Krateros from Kibyra, tentatively dated to 80-90 CE. However, this asiarch is only attested in two inscriptions from ca. 200 CE (IGR IV 907; 912) honouring his descendant Ti. Claudius Polemon who seems to have been asiarch in ca. 170 CE. The date of 80-90 CE is reached by calculating back in steps of about 30 years per generation. Hence this is not really hard evidence for asiarchs before 89/90 CE.

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. M. DRÄGER, *Die Städte der Provinz Asia in der Flaviozeit* (EHS.G 576; Frankfurt/M. 1993) 129; FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 41-49.

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 189-208.

<sup>(21)</sup> Cf. CAMPANILE, "Asiarchi", 79, n. 54; EAD., "Sommi sacerdoti", 549, n. 33.

<sup>(22)</sup> Cf. PIR<sup>2</sup> II C 788; W. ECK, "Claudius II 5. Ti. C. Aristion", *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike* (eds. H. CANKI – H. SCHNEIDER) (Stuttgart – Weimar 1997) III, 13. See also P. SCHERRER, "Das Ehrengrab des Kaiserpriesters am Embolos – Eine Personensuche", ... *KAI ΚΟΣΜΗΣΑΝΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΝ... und verschönernte die Stadt ... Ein ephesischer Priester des Kaiserkultes in seinem Umfeld* (ed. H. THÜR) (SÖAI 27; Wien 1997) 93-112.

<sup>(23)</sup> Only these two among the twelve dedicatory inscriptions mention a νεωκόπος (as a temple official) at all.

508). The undated inscription IvE 638 refers to him as [τὸν ἀ]σιάρχην καὶ [γυ]μνασίάρχον [κα]ὶ πρύτανιν καὶ [νε]ωκόρον. In the heavily damaged inscriptions IvE 425; 425A (not clearly datable)<sup>(24)</sup> he figures presumably as τρις ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας<sup>(25)</sup>, and in IvE 424 (102-114 CE)<sup>(26)</sup>; 5101; 5113 (after 110)<sup>(27)</sup> he is τρις ἀσιάρχης (in IvE 424 also νεωκόρος)<sup>(28)</sup>.

Assuming that ἀσιάρχης and ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας are two distinct offices, one would have to postulate that Ti. Claudius Aristion had some unattested terms of office both as asiarch and as high priest of Asia in order to reach the total of three terms as asiarch by 110-114 and three terms as high priest of Asia at an unspecified time — altogether six terms of office in most prestigious positions. This would certainly be an enormously strong indication for a consistently high social standing and popularity as well as for the will and the ability to spend large sums of money<sup>(29)</sup> for almost three decades, but it is not *a priori* impossible. It certainly weakens this case that some terms of office are not attested in the enormously rich epigraphic corpus of Ephesos and have to be postulated. But it should be kept in mind that, although the extant material is still impressive, many inscribed marble blocks were later re-used as building material (and accordingly damaged or destroyed) or ended up in medieval and early modern lime kilns. Therefore there are always gaps in the epigraphic evidence.

On the other hand, assuming that ἀσιάρχης and ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς

<sup>(24)</sup> Both marble-blocks have been re-used in other buildings, and the inscriptions on them are heavily damaged.

<sup>(25)</sup> The iteration is deduced from a rho in a lacuna on the left of ἀρχ[ι]ερέα in IvE 425,2, which is best restored to [τ]ρις.

<sup>(26)</sup> This inscription on the *Nymphaeum Traiani* contains a dedication to the *Imperator Nerva Traianus Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicus*. Trajan had assumed the title “Dacicus” in autumn 102, and in August 114 he added the title “Optimus”; cf. D. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle*. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie (Darmstadt 1996) 123.

<sup>(27)</sup> Ti. Iulius Aquila, whom these two inscriptions mention as consul, was *consul suffectus* in 110, see the commentary to IvE 5101.

<sup>(28)</sup> It should be pointed out that, in Greek city religion, priesthood was not primarily a matter of vocation and life-long commitment, but rather analogous to a public office which prominent citizens held for a certain period, often one year; cf. e.g. F. PIRENNE-DELFORGE, “Personnel du culte: monde grec. II. Prêtres et prêtresses”, *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum* (eds. V. LAMBRINOUDAKIS – J.C. BALTZ) (Los Angeles, CA 2005) V, 3-31.

<sup>(29)</sup> The building inscription IvE 424 as well as the honorific inscription IvE 425 explicitly point out that Ti. Claudius Aristion erected “public” buildings with his own money (ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων).

Ἀσίας are two designations for one and the same office, the following scenario could be drawn from the extant inscriptions: Ti. Claudius Aristion was high priest for the first time in 88/89, for the second time in 92/93 (now called asiarch) and a third time between 110 and 114 CE, so that he could be designated “three times high priest” and “three times asiarch”<sup>(30)</sup>. By implication, this would provide a date for IvE 425; 425A. However, this elegant solution leaves his high-priestly career with a gap between 93 and (at least) 110. Could it be that he disappeared from the public scene for almost two decades, or that he held other offices in that period? The gap may find some explanation when we consider that, under Trajan, Ti. Claudius Aristion seems to have become a somewhat controversial figure and even had to face trial before the emperor. Pliny the Younger (Ep. 6,31,3) reports:

“Claudius Aristion pleaded his case, the foremost of the Ephesians, a generous man and respected beyond reproach. Hence came envy, and by entirely inadequate people was an accuser sent forth. So he was acquitted and vindicated”.

However, the precise date of this trial seems to be unknown, and the question remains whether this affair damaged him for such a long period – or whether the trial was only the last act in a longer drama. We do not know.

A closer look at the two honorific inscriptions IvE 425 and 638 makes things even more difficult. Both texts belong to the same genre and celebrate Ti. Claudius Aristion for his building activity (IvE 425: ἔργα [?]; IvE 638: ἀναθήματα), by which he has adorned the city of Ephesos. But while in one inscription (IvE 425) he is, among other things, a high priest of Asia, the other inscription (IvE 638) mentions him, among other things, as asiarch. If both designations referred to one and the same office, one would expect the same term to be used in these two very similar texts. Moreover, neither of these inscriptions lists all the offices Ti. Claudius Aristion ever held — IvE 425 mentions his three terms as high priest of Asia and service as secretary and *prytanis* (i.e. as priest in the city’s cultic centre, the *πρυτάνειον*), but not his service as temple-warden (soon after his first term as high priest, see above) or as gymnasiarch; IvE 638 mentions the offices of asiarch<sup>(31)</sup>,

<sup>(30)</sup> Cf. also most recently KIRBIHLER, “Les grands-prêtres”, 116.

<sup>(31)</sup> The inscription is damaged before the word “asiarch”. The lacuna could have contained the article, as reconstructed in the edition: [τὸν ἀ]σιάρχην, but in theory it could also have contained δὲς or τρίς to indicate the iteration. Therefore it is not entirely sure that this inscription looks back on only one term as asiarch.

gymnasiarch, *prytanis* and temple-warden, but not his service as secretary.

This example of one of the most prominent Ephesians (certainly in the period of interest for this contribution) shows that both theories — the identification of high priests and asiarchs and the distinction between the two offices — are not without problems.

### c) The significance of Acts 19,31

The reference to asiarchs in Acts 19,31 is interesting with regard to both aspects outlined above. Firstly, the attestation of the title could provide one possible indication for the date of Luke-Acts. Moreover, a study of Acts 19,31 can contribute to the discussion among historians as to whether or not “asiarch” is another designation for the high priest of the provincial imperial cult.

As to the date of Acts, it has become the majority view that Acts, together with the Gospel of Luke<sup>(32)</sup>, was composed towards the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE<sup>(33)</sup>. Even though the death of Paul is not explicitly narrated, it is presupposed (cf. esp. Acts 20,17-38), and the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE does not seem to be a recent event (cf. Luke 21,24: the *καίροι ἐθνῶν* are understood as a longer period)<sup>(34)</sup>. This brings Luke-Acts fairly close to the marked increase in the epigraphic attestation of asiarchs by 89/90 CE — and this chronological affinity

<sup>(32)</sup> The compositional unity of the two-volume work called Luke-Acts has recently been questioned; for a brief survey cf. R.I. PERVO, *Acts* (ed. H.W. ATTRIDGE) (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2009) 18-20. The differences between Luke and Acts are indeed to be acknowledged, and time is to be allowed for the author's research. But the brief, passing prologue of Acts 1,1 does not give any indication of a greater interval between the *composition* of the Gospel of Luke and Acts.

<sup>(33)</sup> For a discussion of the date cf. WITETSCHEK, *Ephesische Enthüllungen* 1, 245-255. For a decidedly early date (early 60s) cf. A. HARNACK, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament III. Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig 1908); ID., *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament IV. Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien* (Leipzig 1908); J.A.T. ROBINSON, *Redating the New Testament* (London 1976) 86-92; C.J. HEMER, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (ed. C.H. GEMPF) (WUNT 49; Tübingen 1989) 365-410; A. MITTELSTAEDT, *Lukas als Historiker. Zur Datierung des lukanischen Doppelwerkes* (TANZ 43; Tübingen 2006). A late date (110-120) has recently been suggested by R.I. PERVO, *Dating Acts. Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA 2006).

<sup>(34)</sup> Both arguments are questioned by MITTELSTAEDT, *Lukas als Historiker*, 131-163, 165-198. For a detailed discussion see WITETSCHEK, “Paulus und die Asiarchen”, 62-63, n. 13; ID., *Ephesische Enthüllungen* 1, 250-254.

becomes even more relevant if Luke-Acts is indeed a text from Ephesos<sup>(35)</sup>: To be sure, the local colour is quite ambiguous (see above) and can hardly serve as a clear indication for the place of composition of Luke-Acts<sup>(36)</sup>. But Luke devotes very much space to Paul's stay in Ephesos (Acts 18,19–20,1.18–35), and he makes remarkable narrative efforts to present Paul as the first “proper” Christian missionary in Ephesos (Acts 18,19–28) and especially to have Paul deliver his farewell speech (Acts 20,18–35) — his only speech in Acts that is directed to a Christian audience and that clearly addresses the concerns of a Christian community in the time after Paul — to Ephesians. So it seems to be quite a plausible option that the two-volume work of Luke-Acts comes from Ephesos.

As we have seen above, the office of asiarchs did exist before 89/90, but it was apparently only with the inauguration of the temple of the provincial imperial cult in Ephesos that it gained new prominence — to judge by the epigraphic record — and possibly some new quality. Now it could certainly be that in Acts 19,31 Luke refers to “old-style” asiarchs as already Strabon used to know them. In this case it would even be possible to consider this verse as a piece of historical reminiscence. This seems to be what C.J. Hemer meant when he wrote: “The Asiarchs are naturally situated in Ephesus, and the friendship of some of them with Paul is interesting, and not merely to be dismissed as ‘highly unlikely’”<sup>(37)</sup>.

Yet the occurrence of asiarchs in Acts 19,31 takes a peculiar and quite deliberate position in the narrative that points to an authorial intervention. The remarks in Acts 19,30–31 form an aside that interrupts the story of the riot of the silversmiths; the narrative would flow very well — maybe even better — without these two verses<sup>(38)</sup>.

<sup>(35)</sup> Cf. WITETSCHKE, *Ephesische Enthüllungen I*, 255–262. For this localisation cf. also CONZELMANN – LINDEMANN, *Arbeitsbuch*<sup>14</sup>, 360; PERVO, *Acts*, 5–6.

<sup>(36)</sup> Cf. also W. WEREN, “The Riot of the Ephesian Silversmiths (Acts 19,23–40). Luke’s Advice to his Readers”, *Luke and his Readers* (FS A. DENAUX) (eds. R. BIERINGER – G. VAN BELLE – J. VERHEYDEN) (BETL 182; Leuven 2005) 441–456, esp. 453–454.

<sup>(37)</sup> HEMER, *Book of Acts*, 121; the last remark refers to E. HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3; Göttingen 1956) 514, n. 4. HEMER (*Book of Acts*) included the reference to asiarchs in Acts 19,31 among the instances of Luke’s “specific local knowledge” (104: “Specifics of local routes, boundaries, titles of city magistrates, and the like, which may not be closely controllable in date, but are unlikely to have been known except to a writer who has visited the districts”).

<sup>(38)</sup> Cf. A. LOISY, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1920) 750–751; W. ECKEY, *Die Apostelgeschichte. Der Weg des Evangeliums von Jerusalem nach Rom II*.

Thus the reference to the asiarchs seems to be something that Luke deliberately wanted to include in his narrative — not just some historical detail he could not afford to omit<sup>(39)</sup>. If this authorial intervention is acknowledged, then Acts 19,31 can be seen as an actualisation (not exactly an anachronism) and can even provide one more indication for dating Luke-Acts in the 90s or around 100 CE<sup>(40)</sup>.

As to the significance of Acts 19,31 as a historical source in the discussion about asiarchs, this seems to be an occasion to set aside the old maxim “*Christiana non leguntur*”. When Acts 19,31 is used as a piece of evidence in the discussion sketched above and placed alongside the other occurrences of asiarchs, it creates considerable difficulties for the identification of asiarchs and high priests of the provincial imperial cult<sup>(41)</sup>. The obvious problem is that Luke’s phrase *τινὲς ... τῶν ἀσιαρχῶν* suggests that Luke thinks of a greater number of asiarchs (certainly more than three) at the same time in the same place. In the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE the province of Asia had two temples of the provincial imperial cult — in Pergamon (since 29 BCE)<sup>(42)</sup> and in Smyrna (since 23 CE)<sup>(43)</sup> — and accordingly two high priests of this cult. After the assembly of Greek cities in the province (τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας) had been granted a third temple to be built in Ephesos (see below), there was a third high priest in the province, but even this does not add up to the number suggested by Acts 19,31. Historians who identify the asiarchs as high priests of the provincial imperial cult have certainly been aware of the problem. It has been suggested that former asiarchs/high priests kept the title after their term of office, so that there could have been a larger number of people called “asiarchs” in Ephesos<sup>(44)</sup>. However, this does

---

15,26–28,31 (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000) 425: “Zwischenspiel: Was geschieht mit Paulus?”.

<sup>(39)</sup> A good example of the latter would be his slightly nebulous version of the conflict between Paul and Barnabas (Acts 15,36–41) or the somewhat vexed account of Apollos (Acts 18,24–28).

<sup>(40)</sup> The *terminus ad quem* for Luke-Acts is notoriously difficult to determine; cf. A. GREGORY, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus* (WUNT II 169; Tübingen 2003). If one is ready — despite all precautions — to follow the increasingly popular and indeed quite arguable view that the Gospel of John presupposes Luke (also known as an element of the “Louvain hypothesis”), then it is advisable not to push the *terminus ad quem* too far into the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

<sup>(41)</sup> Cf. WITETSCHKE, “Paulus und die Asiarchen”, 66.

<sup>(42)</sup> Cf. BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 17–37.

<sup>(43)</sup> Cf. BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 38–54.

<sup>(44)</sup> Cf. DEININGER, *Provinziallandtage*, 46; CARTER, “Archiereis”, 66, n. 49; similarly already ROSS TAYLOR, “Asiarchs”, 256.

not accord very well with the fact that asiarchs used to hold office for terms of one year and with the iteration attested in honorific inscriptions — Ti. Claudius Aristion is praised as having been asiarch *three times* (IvE 424; 5101; 5113; see above). Moreover, former asiarchs are known as ἀσιαρχήσαντες (IvE 27,240). Thus, Luke would have used rather sloppy language in Acts 19,31<sup>(45)</sup>. A more desperate attempt to reconcile Acts 19,31 with the notion of asiarchs as high priests of the provincial imperial cult is to suppose that Luke mixed up the offices of the provincial and of the municipal imperial cult<sup>(46)</sup>. To be sure, the Roman emperors were already worshipped in Ephesos before the provincial temple was built<sup>(47)</sup>. The inscription IvE 1522 shows that before 6/5 BCE there was a σεβαστήιον, a sanctuary of Augustus; unfortunately this shrine cannot be localised with any certainty. Members of the imperial family also had their place in the *prytaneion*, the cultic centre of the city. But this suggestion, that the asiarchs were high priests of the municipal imperial cult, is basically an attempt to maintain that, apart from the term “asiarchs”, the narrative of Acts gives an accurate account of what really happened to Paul in Ephesos — an interpretation of Acts that has turned out to be quite problematic at many points. Moreover, even if this were the case, the problem would only be transferred from the provincial to the municipal imperial cult: Can we assume that, in the 50s of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, there were at the same time a greater number of high priests of the municipal imperial cult in Ephesos?

On a different level, one can observe that Acts 19,30-31 appears like an insertion that explains why Paul does not himself appear on the scene of the riot narrated in Acts 19,23-40 (see above), a deliberate detour by the author. This puts the historical problem into sharp relief: If the asiarchs were high priests of the imperial cult, would Luke introduce them, of all people, as friends of Paul? It is true that, generally, Luke has a fairly optimistic view of the Roman state and Hellenistic society, and in Acts there are many officials and women and men of high social standing who show a favourable attitude towards the Christian mission in general and Paul in particular. But there is one point where Luke cannot join the mainstream of Hellenistic and

<sup>(45)</sup> This seems to be what SHAUFF, *Theology as History*, 250 suggests.

<sup>(46)</sup> Cf. KIRBIHLER, “Les grands-prêtres”, 110-111, n. 31, who suggests that Acts 19,31 is the result of a “réécriture flavienne”, so that Luke would have used terms of his own time to designate — incorrectly — an office of Paul’s time.

<sup>(47)</sup> Cf. e.g. WITETSCHEK, *Ephesische Enthüllungen* 1, 109-110.

Roman culture, where he says “*Non possumus*”: when the distinction between human and divine gets blurred and humans are awarded divine honours (Acts 10,25-27; 12,21-23; 14,13-15; 16,29-31)<sup>(48)</sup>. In view of this observation one may at least wonder whether Luke would have deliberately introduced high priests of the imperial cult into his narrative<sup>(49)</sup>. In fact the context of Acts 19 does not suggest any specific function of the asiarchs, cultic or otherwise; they are simply introduced as people who are φίλοι towards Paul (in the dative case!). This makes it less likely that any official function is in view<sup>(50)</sup>. It seems that Luke is mainly interested in them as supporters of Paul (and Christianity) who belong to the highest levels of society<sup>(51)</sup>. This is not the only passage in Acts where Paul has excellent connections to the very top of society (see especially Acts 28,7-8, also 13,6-12). So the appearance of asiarchs seems to fit into Luke’s concern to present Christianity as something decent and respectable.

### 3. Νεωκόρος of *Artemis*

In Acts 19,35 the city secretary appeals to the chaotic assembly’s civic pride by calling the city of Ephesos “temple-warden of the great Artemis and of the (image) fallen down from Zeus” (νεωκόρος τῆς

<sup>(48)</sup> Cf. H.-J. KLAUCK, *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (SBS 167; Stuttgart 1996) 46, 56-57, 71-75; ID., “Des Kaisers schöne Stimme. Herrscherkritik in Apg 12,20-23”, *Macht – Religion – Liebe* (Mem. H. MERKLEIN) (eds. M. GIELEN – J. KÜGLER) (Stuttgart 2003) 199-215 = *Religion und Gesellschaft im frühen Christentum*. Neutestamentliche Studien (WUNT 152; Tübingen 2003) 251-267; C.K. ROWE, “Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult. A Way Through the Conundrum?”, *JSNT* 27 (2005) 279-300; WITETSCHEK, “Paulus und die Asiarchen”, esp. 68-71; ID., “Christus und Caesar bei Lukas und Johannes. Der Kaiserkult in Ephesos und das Neue Testament”, *MTZ* 60 (2009) 51-61, 58-60. See also A. BRENT, “Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult in Asia Minor”, *JTS* 48 (1997) 411-438.

<sup>(49)</sup> It is basically this line of reasoning that CAMPANILE, “Asiarchi”, 74 suspects as (partly) the agenda behind the argument for a distinction between high priests and asiarchs. However, what she seems to criticise is an apologetic reasoning on the level of the events narrated in Acts 19, i.e. the attempt to dissociate the “historical Paul” from the imperial cult. On the contrary, the argument presented above concerns not so much the historical plausibility of the events in Paul’s time, but the tendency of Acts as a historical source for Luke’s time.

<sup>(50)</sup> Pace SELINGER, “Demetriosunruhen”, 251 who understands them as an authority (“Behörde”).

<sup>(51)</sup> Cf. LAMPE, “Acta 19”, 63; SHAU, *Theology as History*, 249-250; O. PADILLA, *The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts*. Poetics, Theology and Historiography (SNTSMS 144; Cambridge 2008) 173; PERVO, *Acts*, 496.



μεγάλης Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς)<sup>(52)</sup>. This is striking at first glance, because here the title of a temple official is applied to an entire city. The office of a νεωκόρος seems to have included several (possibly what we would call more “mundane”) aspects of “running” a sanctuary<sup>(53)</sup>. As for Ephesos, it may suffice to mention that Xenophon deposited money with the νεωκόρος of Artemis (Xenophon, *Anab.* 5,3,6-7) and that, as we have seen above, Ti. Claudius Aristion held the office of νεωκόρος at the newly built temple of the Sebastoi.

At a closer look, however, it is by no means a unique feature of Acts 19,35 that this designation of an official is transferred to an entire city. The earliest attestation seems to be provided by the inscription Syll.<sup>3</sup> 799,9-10 (Kyzikos, 38 CE) — as an unofficial title for the city of Kyzikos<sup>(54)</sup>. However, Ephesos was the first city to be granted the designation νεωκόρος as an official title that figured regularly in the city’s documents<sup>(55)</sup>. In the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE the great cities in the province of Asia — Ephesos, Smyrna, Pergamon — engaged in a fierce competition for city titles in which the title νεωκόρος played an essential role; unlike other epithets like πρώτη, μέγιστη or μητρόπολις, it could even be multiplied<sup>(56)</sup>.

However, this official title for the city of Ephesos referred to the temple (later: temples) of the imperial cult. It meant that the temple belonged to the κοινόν, the assembly of the Greek cities in the province of Asia, and that Ephesos hosted the temple on behalf of the κοινόν and provided the necessary infrastructure — and participated in its splendour and prominence<sup>(57)</sup>. It was only under the emperor Caracalla (211-217 CE) that Ephesos officially became νεωκόρος of Artemis (IvE 212)<sup>(58)</sup>. From then on, the city could, in its official

---

(52) For HEMER, *Book of Acts*, 122 this was another instance of Luke’s “specific local knowledge” (see above, n. 37).

(53) Cf. e.g. BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 3-6.

(54) Cf. DRÄGER, *Städte*, 37; BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 5-6, 86.

(55) See the list of inscriptions and coins in BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 79-85.

(56) Cf. the survey in DRÄGER, *Städte*, 113-121. See also E. COLLAS-HEDDELAND, “Le culte impérial dans la compétition des titres sous le haut-empire. Une lettre d’Antonin aux Éphésiens”, *REG* 108 (1995) 410-429.

(57) Cf. BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 343-358.

(58) This development is not taken into account by LAMPE, “Acta 19”, 64 with n. 20: The inscriptions he mentions as evidence for Ephesos being νεωκόρος of Artemis are from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, from the time of Caracalla or even later; in these texts, Ephesos is not only νεωκόρος of Artemis, but also (at least) twice νεωκόρος of the emperors. Hence these inscriptions are only of limited value for illuminating the background of Acts 19.

documents, boast to be τρις νεωκόρος πρώτη, δις μὲν τῶν Σεβαστῶν, ἅπαξ δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος (IvE 300).

This has considerable implications for the study of Acts 19,35: This verse is the earliest clear attestation of Ephesos as νεωκόρος of Artemis<sup>(59)</sup>, and as such it is of essential significance for the discussion among historians. There are, it is true, some coins that are also often interpreted as evidence for Ephesos as νεωκόρος of Artemis in the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, but this interpretation is not undisputed<sup>(60)</sup>.

Some coins from 65/66 CE feature the title νεωκόρος for Ephesos: On RPC I 438, No. 2626; 2627, the obverse shows Nero's laureate head and the legend ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ, the reverse a four-column temple in three-quarter view and the legend ΑΟΥΙΟΛΑ ΑΝΘΥΠΙΑΤΩ ΑΙΧΜΟΚΛΗΣ, ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ, ΕΦ(Ε). On RPC I 438, No. 2628, the obverse shows Nero's laureate head and the legend ΝΕΡΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ, the reverse a six-column temple with two bees and the legend ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ, ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ. However, it is not specified to which temple the designation νεωκόρος in the legends refers. Since the temples on these coins do not exactly match what is known about the Artemision, it is sometimes suggested that these coins refer to a temple of the provincial imperial cult. The provincial imperial temple and the title νεωκόρος, it is argued, would have been granted to Ephesos already under Nero; the latter's violent death and *damnatio memoriae* would have interrupted the construction of the temple and the use of the title, and both would have been resumed under Domitian<sup>(61)</sup>. This theory could find some support in the inscription IvE 2034, a dedication from the theatre which addresses "an emperor who was Germanicus at the time of his eleventh imperial acclamation, and whose name was later obliterated"<sup>(62)</sup>. The number of imperial acclamations would apply to

<sup>(59)</sup> This is also acknowledged by BARRETT, *Acts II*, 935. PERVO, *Acts*, 498, n. 117 suspects that this title "may be a bit of an anachronism here".

<sup>(60)</sup> For this discussion see also WITETSCHEK, *Ephesische Enthüllungen 1*, 114-116.

<sup>(61)</sup> Cf. recently BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 60-61; KIRBIHLER, "Les grands-prêtres", 109, n. 19. Against the possible objection that this postulated act by Nero is not recorded in Tacitus' *Annals*, Kirbihler argues that the year 65 with Piso's conspiracy was otherwise very exciting so that Tacitus could have omitted this relatively minor event, and if the neocorate was conferred only in early 66, it would have been a matter of book 16 of the *Annals*, which is partly lost. This is certainly possible, but far from compelling.

<sup>(62)</sup> BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 62.

Nero between the late summer of 66 and some time in 67 as well as to Domitian between October/November 85 and March/April 86<sup>(63)</sup>. However, the title Germanicus is only restored in a lacuna with the help of the fairly similar building inscription IvE 2035 (also from the theatre) which can be dated to 92 CE. So this theory of a provincial imperial cult in Ephesos under Nero that made the city νεωκόρος is based rather on conjecture than on clear evidence, working mostly with gaps in our sources. In particular, one may wonder if it is at all possible to draw any conclusions from architectural details of the temple depicted on the coins mentioned above, if this temple (supposing it is the imperial temple granted by Nero) was probably not yet built — especially since the two types of coins in question show somewhat different types of temples. Most prominently, Josef Keil dismissed this theory in 1919, arguing for the simpler solution that the neocorate mentioned on these coins refers to Artemis<sup>(64)</sup>. It follows that the unofficial title must have fallen out of use after Ephesos had become νεωκόρος of the emperors, possibly by a settlement under Trajan<sup>(65)</sup>.

The other piece of numismatic evidence for Ephesos as νεωκόρος of Artemis in the later 1<sup>st</sup> century CE is even more problematic: On RPC II 165, No. F1064, the obverse shows the laureate head of Domitian and the legend ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣ — ΓΕΡΜ ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤ, the reverse shows a four-column temple with the statue of the Ephesian Artemis and the legend ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ — ΝΒ ΝΕΟΚ — ΟΡΩΝ. This coin, in the Staatliche Münzsammlung in Munich at least since 1840, is commonly acknowledged to have suffered some “improvements”, i.e. to have been falsified<sup>(66)</sup>. Given this numismatic fact, however, the question remains whether a falsifier would have designed

<sup>(63)</sup> Cf. KIENAST, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, 97, 117.

<sup>(64)</sup> Cf. J. KEIL, “Die erste Kaiserneokorie von Ephesos”, *NZ* 12 (1919) 115–120; referred to with approval by FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 53.

<sup>(65)</sup> Cf. KEIL, “Kaiserneokorie”, 120, n. 12.

<sup>(66)</sup> Cf. D.O.A. KLOSE, “Münz- oder Gruselkabinett? Zu einigen alten Fälschungen kaiserzeitlicher Lokalmünzen Kleinasiens in der Staatlichen Münzsammlung München”, *Internationales Kolloquium zur kaiserzeitlichen Münzprägung Kleinasiens* (eds. J. NOLLÉ – B. OVERBECK – P. WEISS) (Nomismata 1; Milano 1997) 255–263, 257: “... eine äußerst grobe Arbeit mit plumpest retuschierten Legenden, retuschierten Bildern und geglätteten Flächen”. The same could be said for RPC II 165, No. F1065: The obverse shows the head of Domitian’s wife Domitia and the legend ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ – ΣΕΒΑΣΤΗ, the reverse shows an eight-column temple with the statue of the Ephesian Artemis and the legend ΚΟΡΩΙ (sic) – ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ.

a new “ancient” coin or rather imitated an existing coin as closely as possible. Moreover, the falsification must have happened before 1840, at a time when the Ephesian inscriptions referring to the imperial cult and to Ephesos as νεωκόρος of the provincial imperial cult under Domitian were not yet known. At that time there would have been hardly any motivation, apologetic or otherwise, to provide “evidence” for Ephesos as νεωκόρος of Artemis in the time of Domitian (the case would have to be judged differently if there were Claudius or Nero on the obverse). However, it seems that the numismatic discussion must remain inconclusive.

It is at this impasse that Acts 19,35 ought to be taken seriously as a historical source for how Ephesians in the late 1<sup>st</sup> century could understand themselves and their city. Usually, however, when Acts 19,35 is taken into consideration with regard to the title νεωκόρος, this text tends to be used as a report of what was actually said while Paul was in Ephesos in the early/mid-50s. A characteristic example is the assessment by B. Burrell who needs this approach to Acts in order to maintain the impossibility of addressing Ephesos as νεωκόρος of Artemis between Nero and Caracalla:

“... yet the grammateus’ use of the term ‘neokoros of Artemis’ as if it were well known would not have been permitted in the early second century, as by that time Ephesos was officially neokoros of the Augusti, and only of the Augusti. Indeed, the title would not have been appropriate again until Ephesos did become neokoros of Artemis, at the beginning of the third, not the second century ...”<sup>(67)</sup>.

Given Luke’s general use of speeches as vehicles of his own views and concerns<sup>(68)</sup> as well as the deliberate literary elaboration<sup>(69)</sup> and, in particular, the slightly “updated” language in Acts 19 (e.g. the asiarchs, see above), this is hardly a viable approach to this text. It seems that Acts 19,23–40 addresses the concerns of Luke’s readers in the late 1<sup>st</sup> century, when Christianity in Asia Minor would already have become a factor that made some impact on the economy. It may not be by chance that Paul’s farewell speech to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20,18–35 is very preoccupied with the use of money. Demetrios’ complaint in Acts 19,25–27 can then be paralleled to what Pliny the Younger writes in Ep. 10,96,10<sup>(70)</sup>.

<sup>(67)</sup> BURRELL, *Neokoroi*, 60, n. 11.

<sup>(68)</sup> Cf. most recently PADILLA, *Speeches of Outsiders*, 178–188 and passim.

<sup>(69)</sup> Cf. e.g. SELINGER, “Demetriosunruhen”, 259.

<sup>(70)</sup> Cf. H. KOESTER, “Ephesos und Paulus in der frühchristlichen Literatur”,

If this is a valid approach to Acts, then the narrative of chapter 19 is not so much a source for what happened to Paul and his companions in the 50s of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, but rather for the situation towards the end of the century<sup>(71)</sup>. For the discussion about Ephesos as νεώκοπος of Artemis, this means that the title was known and could be used in the late 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, even at a time when Ephesos had already officially become νεώκοπος of the provincial imperial cult (and when asiarchs were already prominent enough for Luke to include them in his narrative). In fact, the city's newly acquired dignity in the imperial cult did by no means lead to a neglect of the traditional city goddess Artemis. Many building inscriptions from this period (e.g. IvE 413; 418; 424; 2034; 2035) contain dedications to both Artemis and the emperor. In 104 CE the foundation by the new citizen C. Vibius Salutaris (documented in IvE 27) included regular processions that emphasised the unique significance of Artemis as the city-goddess of Ephesos<sup>(72)</sup>. In this context Luke could plausibly put a reference to Ephesos as νεώκοπος of Artemis on the secretary's lips as something generally known and accepted<sup>(73)</sup>. The idea that the goddess' statue in the Artemision of Ephesos has fallen down from Zeus (τὸ διοπετές) is not attested elsewhere, but it coheres well with the unchallenged significance of Artemis<sup>(74)</sup>.

For the historical discussion, this means that the ambiguous numismatic evidence for Ephesos as νεώκοπος of Artemis in the late 1<sup>st</sup>

---

*100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos*. Akten des Symposions Wien 1995. Textband (eds. H. FRIESINGER – F. KRINZINGER) (DÖAW.PH 260 – Archäologische Forschungen 1; Wien 1999) 297-305, esp. 303-304; J.C. WALTERS, "The Coincidence of the Expansion of Christianity and the Egyptian Cults in Imperial Ephesos", *100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos*, 315-324, esp. 320; WITETSCHKE, *Ephesische Enthüllungen* 1, 255.

<sup>(71)</sup> Cf. also WEREN, "Riot", 453-456.

<sup>(72)</sup> Cf. G.M. ROGERS, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos*. Foundation Myths of a Roman City (London – New York 1991). See also R. STRELAN, *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus* (BZNW 80, Berlin – New York 1996) 41-83. — To be sure, in this context Ephesos is not referred to as νεώκοπος of Artemis.

<sup>(73)</sup> Cf. FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros*, 54.

<sup>(74)</sup> It is often suggested that this motif creates a contrast between the "true" cult of Artemis and the mingling of religion and commerce, abhorred by Luke, that has become so evident in Demetrios' speech (Acts 19,25-27); cf. e.g. SELINGER, "Demetriosunruhen", 255, n. 70. In the setting of the secretary's speech (Acts 19,35-40) it could also serve to dissociate Paul's alleged polemic against "what has come about through (the work of) hands" (Acts 19,26) from Artemis; cf. SHAU, *Theology as History*, 255-256.

century CE presented above is supported by a contemporary literary source. These coins can thus more plausibly be interpreted in the sense that, in the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century, citizens of Ephesos could indeed refer to their city as νεωκόρος of the city goddess Artemis. In the interpretation of Acts 19, exegetes profit greatly from the more than occasional glance into the field of ancient history. It has proven enormously helpful to locate biblical texts in their historical con-texts (in the widest sense). In the case of Acts 19,35, however, exegetes are not only on the receiving, but also on the giving side. This is one remarkable occasion where a text from the New Testament can contribute in a productive way to a discussion among historians.

\*  
\* \*

What do we learn from this tour through diverse historical and exegetical problems? Acts 19 is a historical source. But it has to be taken into account that Luke does not straightforwardly report “what really happened”. History serves as a vehicle of theology, telling history is a way of speaking about God’s guidance and of reassuring the present audience of their present identity by pointing to their roots in the normative past: This, I would contend, is what Luke means by the ἀσφάλεια he wishes to convey to Theophilus about what the latter has learnt (Luke 1,4). Luke commits himself to this theological and indeed pastoral endeavour at a particular point in space and time, some elements of which are present in Acts 19. Thus, when the “Karl May rule” is applied, Acts 19 may not be an absolutely and unquestionably trustworthy historical source that might unequivocally inform us about events in the 50s of the 1<sup>st</sup> century, but it is a source that informs us about Luke’s concerns in his own time. The strong Ephesian local colour does not guarantee historical accuracy, but it gives some clues about the world in which Luke lived — as is argued here, the Ephesos of the late 1<sup>st</sup> century, where the office of asiarchs had acquired new prominence and the cult of Artemis lost nothing of its vitality. It is in this sense that Acts 19 is a highly important source — for both exegetes and historians.

Universität Regensburg  
Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät  
Universitätsstraße 31  
D-93053 Regensburg, Germany

Stephan WITETSCHEK

## SUMMARY

Luke's account about Paul's stay in Ephesos (Acts 19) is well known for its strong local colour, two elements of which are studied in this contribution: the asiarchs (19,31) and the title νεωκόρος (temple-warden) for Ephesos (19,35). The appearance of asiarchs in Acts questions the view that the asiarchs were the high-priests of the provincial imperial cult. Acts 19,35 contributes to the discussion about city-titles in the 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> centuries CE. In both instances, Acts is a source not so much for the narrated time of Paul, but rather for Luke's own time, and as such of interest for both exegetes and historians.

## Gentile Incorporation into Israel in Ezra – Nehemiah? (\*)

Ezra – Nehemiah (EN) is well known for its separatist policy concerning gentiles. This stance is in strong contrast with the assimilationist approach found in other texts generally dated to the post-exilic period (e.g., Esther, Trito-Isaiah, Ruth, and Chronicles). Two exceptions in EN are the possible participation of foreigners in the Passover ceremony (Ezra 6,19-21) and the community pledge to follow the Torah (Neh 10,29[28]). This paper will examine whether these cases indeed exhibit an anomalous inclusiveness, and if so, how it can be understood within the wider ethno-theological thrust of EN. It will be argued that the key to understanding lies in the way EN draws on important themes found in antecedent Passover celebrations, the most significant of which is that it is only by partaking of the Passover that a person can be incorporated into the ‘true’ Israel.

### 1. *Themes Drawn from Antecedent Passover Observances in the HB*

The observance of the Passover is recorded a number of times in the HB. Those which precede that in EN will be examined to derive common themes. Critical orthodoxy views these texts as being authoritative by the time of the composition of Ezra 1–6<sup>(1)</sup>, and thus

(\*) My thanks to Mark Leuchter, Shani Berrin Tzoref, and Ronald Clements for commenting on earlier versions of this article.

(1) The current consensus is that Ezra 1-6 was written and/or edited after the rest of EN was written. See, *inter alios*, L.C. ALLEN – T.S. LANIAK, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Peabody, MA 2003) 10; M.A. THRONTVEIT, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY 1992) 9-10. Following H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, “The Composition of Ezra i-vi”, *JTS* 34 (1983) 1-30, many scholars hold the view that this redactor is separate from the Chronicler, yet may still derive from the same circle that had redacted the books of Chronicles. Hence, thematic similarities can be expected to be found between Chronicles and Ezra 1-6. G.N. KNOPPERS, *I Chronicles 1-9* (AB 12; Garden City, NY 2004) 96, n. 108, however, restricts the reworking to Ezra 1-3 on the following grounds: (1) The dedication of the Second Temple lacks clear parallels with Solomon’s Temple dedication (2 Chr 5–7), instead drawing primarily on legal materials; (2) The appointment of priests in their courses and Levites in their divisions (Ezra 6,18) is similar to 1 Chr 23–26, but the authorization formula is ‘as it is written in the book of Moses’, instead of referring to David; and (3) Zerubbabel is not mentioned at either the dedication (Ezra 6,13-18), or the Passover (6,19-22). While S. JAPHET, *I and II Chronicles*



can be taken on their own literary terms as part of a common tradition.

a) Exodus 12,43-49

According to biblical account, the first Passover implies the concept of Israel as a nation (Exod 12,3)<sup>(2)</sup>. It is closely connected to the tenth plague that strikes down the firstborn of Egypt (12,29-32). This reinforces 'the distinction between Egypt and Israel' (11,7); those who are members of Israel and those who are not. It might be expected, then, that the Passover would be restricted to the Israelites. Yet even at the institution of the ritual, members of the 'mixed multitude' (ערב רב)<sup>(3)</sup> who joined Israel in leaving Egypt (Exod 12,38) have the opportunity to participate (Exod 12,43-49).

The general restriction of non-assimilating 'foreigners' (בן נכר)<sup>(4)</sup>, including the 'resident' (תושב) and the 'hired worker' (שכיר) is first asserted (12,43,45)<sup>(5)</sup>. The only two groups of foreigners permitted to participate in the Passover are the 'purchased slave' (עבד מקנה כסף)<sup>(6)</sup> and the 'resident alien' (גר)<sup>(7)</sup>. The slave is to partake of the Passover as a member of his owner's household (12,44,46). This is consistent with legislation found elsewhere in the HB, which includes dependents as part of a religious celebration (e.g., Lev 22,10-11; Deut 16,11,14). Similarly, the resident alien can also observe the Passover,

---

(Louisville, KY 1993) 18; S. JAPHET, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew", VT 18 (1968) 330-371, also denies the common authorship of Chronicles and EN, she argues that EN is the prior composition. For these reasons this paper will examine the Passover celebrations historically antecedent to EN, excluding the accounts in Chronicles, viz. Hezekiah (2 Chr 30) and Josiah (2 Chr 35-36).

(<sup>2</sup>) For the first time, each member of a fathers' house (בית אב) is also identified as part of a larger social group: the congregation of Israel (עדת ישראל).

(<sup>3</sup>) Cf. דאמפסף, the *hapax legomenon* in Numbers 11,4 describing the same group of people with a derogatory tone ('riffraff' in NJPS).

(<sup>4</sup>) Although literally 'son of a foreigner', in the context of this passage, in which verses 43 and 45 form an inclusio, it is best understood generally as 'foreigners', paralleling the more specific 'resident' and 'hired worker' (12,45). This is consistent with the usage of בן נכר elsewhere in the HB (Gen 17,12,27; Lev 22,25; Ezek 44,9).

(<sup>5</sup>) Cf. Lev 22,10, where the תושב and שכיר are grouped with the 'stranger' (זר).

(<sup>6</sup>) Although not all slaves were purchased, the qualification here is probably used to heighten the distinction between slaves and the semi-free resident/hired worker. Cf. W.H. PROPP, *Exodus 1-18* (AB 2; Garden City, NY 1998) 417.

(<sup>7</sup>) This interpretation, 12,48 as restricting 12,45, is similar in principle to PROPP, *Exodus 1-18*, 419, but differing in detail.

as one who is willing to assimilate<sup>(8)</sup> into Israelite society (Exod 12,48)<sup>(9)</sup>. Through the rite of circumcision, for both these groups there is a transfer of status from 'outsider' to 'insider'. Those circumcised now have the external sign of membership within the covenant community, as established in Gen 17<sup>(10)</sup>.

#### b) Numbers 9,1-14

The second Passover observance according to the biblical record occurs after the completion of the tabernacle (Num 9,1-14). Similar to the book of Exodus, allowance is made for the assimilating resident alien (גר) to partake of the Passover according to its statute and rule (Num 9,14)<sup>(11)</sup>. If anyone is present and able but refuses to perform the Passover, they are to be 'cut off from his people' (נכרתה הנפש ההוא) (מעמיה; Num 9,13)<sup>(12)</sup>. There is some discussion surrounding the exact nature of being 'cut off' (כרת). The main interpretations are that it involves excommunication from the community<sup>(13)</sup>, death by man<sup>(14)</sup>, or death at the hand of God<sup>(15)</sup>. Since exclusion from the camp in the wilderness would lead to death, the common underlying idea is that it is tantamount to a death sentence<sup>(16)</sup>. The only exceptions are those who are deemed to be unclean, or are on a distant journey. These

<sup>(8)</sup> A גר can either be assimilating or not. See K.L. SPARKS, *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel*. Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible (Winona Lake, IN 1998) 240-241.

<sup>(9)</sup> Along with the slave, a גר may be part of an Israelite household (e.g., Exod 20,10). This is not always the case, as evidenced in the laws grouping the גר with the poor in requiring assistance from wealthy landowners (e.g., Lev 19,10; 23,22; Deut 24,14).

<sup>(10)</sup> Uncircumcised males were not members of the community and were excluded (Gen 17,14).

<sup>(11)</sup> Most scholars assume the גר must be circumcised, based on the dependence of this passage upon Exod 12,48-49. See, e.g., M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1975) 103; B.A. LEVINE, *Numbers 1-20* (AB 4; Garden City, NY 1993) 297.

<sup>(12)</sup> The punishment of being 'cut off' from the Israelite community is ordained for such offences as violation of the Sabbath and holy days (Exod 12,15-19; 31,14; Lev 23,29), the eating of blood and fat from sacrifices (Lev 7,25,27), eating sacrificial flesh while unclean (Lev 7,20-21) or on the third day (Lev 19,7-8), refusal to be circumcised (Gen 17,14; Lev 12,3), and certain sexual offenses (Lev 20,17-18). For a complete list, see G.F. HASEL, 'כרת', *TDOT* VII, 347-348; J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3; Garden City, NY 1992) 458.

<sup>(13)</sup> E.g., P.J. BUDD, *Numbers* (WBC 5; Waco, TX 1984) 98; R.A. COLE, *Exodus* (TOTC; London 1973) 109.

<sup>(14)</sup> E.g., G.B. GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers* (ICC; Edinburgh 1976) 84-85.

groups of people are still to perform the ritual, but on the same day in the following month (Num 9,10-11). Thus, Passover observance was a symbol of membership in Israel, with non-participants being removed from the community of Israel.

c) Deuteronomy 16,1-8

Although this text does not describe a Passover observance, its generally agreed provenance prior to EN means that it would have an impact on the understanding of the festival in EN. The central focus of the Passover legislation is the celebration/commemoration of the Exodus (16,1.3.6), the formative event for the nation of Israel. Other foci in the legislation are consistent with general Deuteronomic concerns: the location of this festival at ‘the place YHWH will choose’ (Deut 16,2.6) is consistent with its emphasis on a centralized place to worship YHWH (Deut 12,1-28); and its transformation from a family-based setting to an annual pilgrimage festival consistent with its aim to forge a single unified nation<sup>(17)</sup>.

While the Passover stipulations do not explicitly mention the involvement of ‘foreigners’, their participation can be deduced from a wider reading of Deuteronomy. The summary for the three annual pilgrimage festivals specifies ‘all your males’ (כל זכורך; Deut 16,16) as the attendees<sup>(18)</sup>. Since the full list of those attending the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Booths includes the resident alien within their community (Deut 16,11.14), it can be inferred that this group would also be involved in the Passover.

<sup>(15)</sup> E.g., J. MILGROM, *Numbers* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia, PA 1990) 405-408. This is the view of most Jewish exegetes, e.g., Ibn Ezra on Gen 17,14.

<sup>(16)</sup> For a discussion of the possibility that punishment extends to the life to come, see MILGROM, *Leviticus 1-16*, 458-460; G.J. WENHAM, *Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1979) 242.

<sup>(17)</sup> ‘All Israel’ is used as a descriptor of or form of address to the whole community in Deut 1,1; 5,1; 11,6; 13,11; 18,6; 21,21; 27,9; 29,2; 31,1.7.11; 32,45; 34,12. The Book of Deuteronomy as a national constitution document is presented, programmatically, by S.D. MCBRIDE, “Polity of the Covenant People: The Book of Deuteronomy”, *Int* 41 (1987) 229-244.

<sup>(18)</sup> The direct reference to female participation in the preceding legislation (Deut 16,11.14) suggests that only the males were required to attend, but others were also welcome. So P.C. CRAIGIE, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1976) 246; E.H. MERRILL, *Deuteronomy* (NAC 4; Nashville, TN 1994) 255-256; J.H. TIGAY, *Deuteronomy* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia, PA 1996) 159. Cf. Deut 12,7.12.18; 14,26; 31,10-12.

The participation of assimilated foreigners would also be consistent with Deuteronomic ideology. For instance, Deut 5,2-3 underlines the contemporary nature of the covenant:

YHWH our God made a covenant with us at Horeb.  
Not with our fathers did he make this covenant, but with us,  
with all of us who are alive here today.

The covenant and its requirements, as found in the laws that follow, have been made with those currently living. The main point is that the covenant is continuous across generations; thus, it is just as binding for the new generation<sup>(19)</sup>. The adversative stance<sup>(20)</sup>, however, sets the present generation against the previous, and downplays the connection to their forefathers. In the same vein, the focus on the importance of learning and carefully obeying the statutes and rules (Deut 5,1) has the effect of linking Israelite identity more closely with allegiance to the covenant/law than with lineage. As Baruch Halpern notes, the predominantly second person singular address of the laws contributes to the devaluation of kinship: 'the lawgiver speaks directly to the individual, his voice unmediated by lineage usage'<sup>(21)</sup>. The laws insisting upon the denunciation of relatives reinforce this viewpoint (Deut 13,7-12[6-11]). Even if an Israelite is pressed by a close relative to give up the covenant with YHWH in favour of other gods, no mercy is to be shown them: they are to hand them over to be stoned to death (13,9-10[8-9]). Loyalty to the covenant community overrides loyalty to the family<sup>(22)</sup>. Thus, the preference given to covenant over kinship in Deuteronomy is consistent with Passover observance by assimilated foreigners.

#### d) Joshua 5,10-12

This passage describes the first Passover in the land of Canaan, and has ties with the first Passover celebration in Egypt. It follows the miraculous crossing of the Jordan River (Josh 5,10-12), which is rem-

<sup>(19)</sup> Cf. M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy 1-11* (AB 5; Garden City, NY 1991) 237-238.

<sup>(20)</sup> Cf. Deut 11,2-7; 29,13-14[14-15].

<sup>(21)</sup> B. HALPERN, "Jerusalem and the Lineages in the Seventh Century BCE: Kinship and the Rise of Individual Moral Liability", *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel* (eds. B. HALPERN – D.W. HOBSON) (Sheffield 1991) 75.

<sup>(22)</sup> Indeed, there is a sense of the Israelite brotherhood or Israel as one extended kinship group in Deuteronomy (e.g., Deut 15,3.7.9.11.12; 17,15; 19,18-19; 22,1-2). See the discussion of 'brother theology' in SPARKS, *Ethnicity*, 236-238.

iniscient of the crossing of the Sea of Reeds (4,23; Exod 14). If the first Passover signified the beginning of YHWH's redemption, then its observance in the Promised Land signified its completion. Both are celebrated at the same date and time (5,10; Exod 12,6.18). And in both instances it is preceded by the rite of circumcision (5,2-9; Exod 12,48). Indeed, circumcision is explicitly linked back to the larger story of the exodus (Josh 5,2-9). Since both of these ceremonies are related to God's covenant with his people<sup>(23)</sup>, they once again function to mark out those who are members of Israel<sup>(24)</sup>, as they enter a new national phase in the Promised Land<sup>(25)</sup>.

e) 2 Kings 23,21-23

The description of Josiah's Passover in the deuteronomistic account follows the purge of idols, priests, and sacred places (2 Kgs 23,4-20), and is followed by further cleansing of the land (23,24). The account of his reforms also indicates an interest in the northern kingdom, as the drawn-out description highlights (23,15-20). Given the admixture of northern Israelites and foreigners transplanted by Assyria (2 Kgs 17,24-41), part of the aim of Josiah's Passover was to forge a new nation just as the Exodus had done centuries before<sup>(26)</sup>. This was part of a set of widespread reforms instituted by Josiah, based on and driven by Deuteronomy<sup>(27)</sup> (2 Kgs 23,21)<sup>(28)</sup>. As noted supra, Deuteronomy displaced kinship and ethnic boundaries, and re-

<sup>(23)</sup> M.H. Woudstra, *The Book of Joshua* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1981) 98.

<sup>(24)</sup> The national observance of the Passover is consistent with the 'all Israel' theme of the book of Joshua.

<sup>(25)</sup> As L.D. Hawk, *Joshua* (Berit Olam; Collegeville, PA 2000) 75, comments, circumcision and the celebration of Passover 'depict the beginning of a new era by reporting the performance of rites that constitute primary markers of community identity'. The main emphasis of the Joshua account is on the change in diet, from manna to the produce of the land (Josh 5,11-12). For a concentric structuring of Josh 5,11-12 that emphasizes this dietary change, see R.S. Hess, *Joshua* (TOTC; Leicester 1996) 124. This symbolizes the end of the wilderness period and the beginning of life in the land.

<sup>(26)</sup> M. Leuchter, *Josiah's Reform and Jeremiah's Scroll*. Historical Calamity and Prophetic Response (Sheffield 2006) 60.

<sup>(27)</sup> For a presentation and discussion of the critical position on the Book of the Covenant (2 Kgs 23,2) as Deuteronomy or its early nucleus, see, e.g., E.W. Nicholson, *Deuteronomy and Tradition* (Philadelphia, PA 1967) 1-17.

<sup>(28)</sup> Although Josiah had begun repairs on the temple prior to finding the Book of the Law (2 Kgs 22,3-7), the impetus for his further extensive reforms derives from its discovery (22,8-20).

placed them with adherence to the law as the covenant identity marker. The Passover was just one manifestation of this application of the law.

Parallels have been drawn between Josiah and Joshua. Richard Nelson notes a number of similarities that are germane to this discussion. They both take directions from 'the book of the Torah' (ספר התורה; 2 Kgs 22,8-13; 23,2-3) or 'a copy of the Torah' (משנה תורה; Josh 8,32)<sup>(29)</sup>. Additionally, Joshua and Josiah are the only figures in deuteronomistic history who observe the Passover (Josh 5,10-12; 2 Kgs 23,22)<sup>(30)</sup>. Marvin Sweeney adds that Joshua leads a united Israel free of Canaanite influence, just as Josiah 'attempts to purify the land of pagan influence and unify the people around the worship of YHWH'<sup>(31)</sup>. Josiah is the king who destroys the Bethel altar, putting an end to the apostasy led by Jeroboam<sup>(32)</sup>, and casting Josiah as the successor to the northern dynasties<sup>(33)</sup>. These similarities between Josiah and Joshua, in turn, can be traced back to Moses, the first leader of a united Israel to whom was entrusted the Law, as well as the institution of the Passover.

In summary, the Passover rite derives from the exodus, a formative tradition within Israelite history as presented in the HB. In this event YHWH delivers his people from bondage to enter the Promised Land. The exodus is central to the formation of a unified nation, Israel. Subsequently, the celebration of this significant event occurs at key turning points in the nation's history, such as completion of the Tabernacle, and entry into the Promised Land<sup>(34)</sup>. At these points it is

<sup>(29)</sup> R.D. NELSON, "Josiah in the Book of Joshua", *JBL* 100 (1981) 534-535.

<sup>(30)</sup> NELSON, "Josiah", 536. This is in contrast to the Chronicler, who describes an important reforming Passover under Hezekiah (2 Chr 30).

<sup>(31)</sup> M.A. SWEENEY, *King Josiah of Judah*. The Lost Messiah of Israel (Oxford 2001) 26.

<sup>(32)</sup> W.E. LEMKE, "The Way of Obedience: 1 Kings 13 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History", *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God*. Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright (eds. F.M. CROSS – W.E. LEMKE – P.D. MILLER) (Garden City, NY 1976) 301-326.

<sup>(33)</sup> SWEENEY, *King Josiah*, 173-174.

<sup>(34)</sup> In this sense, the Passover symbolically functions as a 'rite of passage'. According to A.V. GENNEP, *The Rites of Passage* (London 1960) 3, these rites enable the passage 'from one defined position to another which is equally well defined'. In their narrative settings, Passover observances are not only commemorative; they also have a transformative function. See T. PROSIC, *The Development and Symbolism of Passover until 70 CE* (JSOTSS 414; London 2004) 81-82.

especially necessary to identify those who are part of Israel as it moves forward into its next stage of national history. Thus, at least one function of the Passover is to either reaffirm or delineate membership within Israel as a nation.

## 2. *The Passover in EN*

The observance of the Passover in EN both continues certain themes found in Passover observances in the HB and develops others.

### a) Ezra 6,19-22

In EN the return of the exiles from Babylon is presented as a second exodus<sup>(35)</sup>. For instance, the provision of silver, gold, and other gifts for the returnees as they leave Babylon (Ezra 1,4.6) is reminiscent of the departure from Egypt (Exod 3,21-22; 11,2; 12,35-36). The statement closing chapter 1, describing the exiles as ‘brought up from Babylon to Jerusalem’ (העלות הגולה מבבל לירושלם; Ezra 1,11) is the echo of ‘brought up out of the land of Egypt, to the land’ (העלית) (מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֶל הָאָרֶץ; Exod 33,1)<sup>(36)</sup>. Following the list of returnees in chapter 2, chapters 1–6 then describe the rebuilding of the temple amidst opposition. Upon completion of the temple, the Passover is celebrated at the end of Ezra 6. Hence, there is a deliberate drawing upon the exodus from Egypt in the description of the return from Babylon throughout the first major section of EN (Ezra 1–6)<sup>(37)</sup>.

<sup>(35)</sup> S. JAPHET, “People and Land in the Restoration Period”, *From the Rivers of Babylon to the Highlands of Judah*. Collected Studies on the Restoration Period (Winona Lake, IN 2006) 112; THRONTVEIT, *Ezra-Nehemiah* 15-18; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco, TX 1985) 15-19; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, “The Torah and History in Presentations of Restoration in Ezra – Nehemiah”, *Reading the Law*. Studies in Honour of Gordon J. Wenham (eds. J.G. McCONVILLE – K. MÖLLER) (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament studies 461; New York, NY 2007) 161-162.

<sup>(36)</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 19.

<sup>(37)</sup> Its reference to YHWH changing the attitude of the king towards the Jews (Ezra 6,22) marks the conclusion to the section, which began with the same theological sentiment (1,1). WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 73, suggests the author reverted back to Hebrew to draw attention the concluding nature of this paragraph (6,19-22). Although most current scholars agree that Ezra 1-6 is a literary unit, there is debate concerning its compositional history. WILLIAMSON, “The Composition of Ezra i-vi”, 1-30, argues that Ezra 1-6 was composed after the completion of Ezra 7-Neh 13, and is therefore the final stage in the formation of Ezra – Nehemiah. More recently, J.L. WRIGHT, *Rebuilding Identity*. The Nehemiah-Memoir and its Earliest Readers (BZAW 348; Berlin 2004) 338-339,

A closer examination of the Passover in EN reveals a number of similarities with the exodus. As a commemoration of the exodus, it is kept on the same date (Ezra 6,19; cf. Exod 12,6.18), and the Feast of Unleavened Bread is kept for seven days (Ezra 6,22; cf. Exod 12,14-20). The celebration of the Passover after the completion of the temple (Ezra 6,14-15) draws parallels with its celebration after the tabernacle is completed (Num 9,1-14). Furthermore, Israel is described as 'the returned exiles' (Ezra 6,19), which in this context alludes to their recent history of freedom from bondage, just as in the exodus account Israel was redeemed from Egypt to enter the Promised Land. Similar to Joshua 5,10-12, the Passover in EN marks the completion of YHWH's work of deliverance. Thus, there is a thematic continuity in the Passover in EN with its observance during the exodus journey.

The Passover in EN also develops themes found in antecedent observances in the HB. In particular, there is a strong emphasis on purity<sup>(38)</sup>. Before the Passover lamb is slaughtered, the priests and Levites needed to be purified (Ezra 6,20), while there is no specific mention of the rest of the people needing to undergo purification. Impurity as a condition for exclusion from participating in the Passover had been outlined in Numbers 9,6-11. It had a specific cause (touching a dead body), and it was only temporary (those unclean could still keep it on the same day of the next month). By contrast, in EN all non-Israelites, designated 'the peoples of the land', are deemed unclean. Since the Passover is observed by 'the people who had returned from exile', along with 'everyone who had joined them and separated himself from the uncleanness of the peoples of the land to worship YHWH, the God of Israel' (Ezra 6,21)<sup>(39)</sup>, then the implication is that all those outside the community of Israel are unclean.

---

suggests that Ezra 1-6 was a response to an early stratum of the Nehemiah corpus, while R.C. STEINER, "Bishlam's Archival Search Report in Nehemiah's Archive: Multiple Introductions and Reverse Chronological Order as Clues to the Origin of the Aramaic Letters in Ezra 4-6", *JBL* 125 (2006) 674-676, adds that an early stratum of material in Ezra 4-6 was drawn from Nehemiah's archive.

<sup>(38)</sup> J.B. SEGAL, *The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (London 1963) 12, 226.

<sup>(39)</sup> David Janzen interprets the initial *waw* as explicative rather than consecutive; ID., "The Cries of Jerusalem: Ethnic, Cultic, Legal, and Geographical Boundaries in Ezra-Nehemiah", *Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah*. Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader (eds. M.J. BODA – P.L. REDDITT) (Sheffield 2008) 125-126. This renders his translation of the second phrase in Ezra 6,21 as 'that is,



Because of the impurity of the peoples of the land in EN, the Passover can only be celebrated by Israel and those who are willing to devote themselves to Israel and its God. Scholars are divided over whether the phrase ‘all who joined them’ refers to Jews who separated themselves from the surrounding peoples or to foreigners who separated<sup>(40)</sup>. Two factors render the latter option as most likely. First, within the outlook of EN, the recognition of a legitimate group of Jews outside those who returned from exile is generally denied<sup>(41)</sup>. Hence, those who joined Israel ‘should be regarded proselytes’<sup>(42)</sup>. Second, within the context of antecedent Passovers in the HB discussed *supra*, this would refer to those foreigners who are willing to assimilate into Israel. An allowance for their participation is mentioned in Exod 12, Num 9, Deut 16, and 2 Kgs 23. Thus, according to the biblical record, foreigners were involved in the Passover from the formation of the nation Israel to its last throes under the Judean monarchy, and into the post-exilic period.

In contrast to Exodus 12, however, the requirement for foreigners to undergo circumcision prior to partaking of the Passover is not mentioned<sup>(43)</sup>. Its omission is consistent with the ideology of EN, in

---

all who had separated themselves from the impurity of the nations of the land to them’. For a convincing refutation of Janzen’s translation, and an argument for the standard translation, see H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, “More Unity Than Disunity”, *Unity and Disunity in Ezra-Nehemiah*. Redaction, Rhetoric, and Reader (eds. M.J. BODA – P.L. REDDITT) (Sheffield 2008) 335-336.

<sup>(40)</sup> Scholars who interpret Ezra 6,21 as incorporating foreigners include J. BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (OTL; Philadelphia, PA 1988) 133; JAPHET, “People”, 115; J.M. MYERS, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (AB 14; Garden City, NY 1965); SPARKS, *Ethnicity*, 295, 318-319; WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 85. Scholars who interpret Ezra 6,21 as excluding foreigners and only allowing non-exiled Judeans include L.W. BATTEN, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (ICC; Edinburgh 1913) 153; M. BRENNEMAN, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Nashville, TN 1993) 122; M.G. BRETT, *Decolonizing God. The Bible in the Tides of Empire* (Sheffield 2008) 116, n. 11.

<sup>(41)</sup> See JAPHET, “People”, 108-115.

<sup>(42)</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 85.

<sup>(43)</sup> The omission is not discussed in most commentaries. Exceptions include D.J.A. CLINES, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 97, who suggests that circumcision may be in view as the sign of separation from uncleanness, and BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 133, who comments that silence regarding the requirement is ‘perhaps significant’. Cf. Isaiah 56,1-8, which mentions keeping the Sabbath as an identity marker but not circumcision. For the contrary view, see S.J.D. COHEN, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*. Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties (Berkeley, CA 1999) 219-221, who argues that there is

which there is a downplaying of the overall importance of external identity markers — temple and monarchy — as foundational for Israelite identity. Instead, obedience to the Torah gains greater significance<sup>(44)</sup>. The omission of circumcision as a prerequisite for participation in the Passover, in preference to devotion to YHWH (Ezra 6,21; Neh 10,29[28]), reflects this tendency on an individual level. Nonetheless, EN still clearly outlines the entrance requirements into 'Israel' (6,21):

- 1) Separation from the peoples/nations of the lands; and
- 2) Seeking YHWH, the God of Israel.

The main point is that only those who exclusively turn to YHWH are accepted as members of 'Israel'. As will be discussed infra, the implication is that not all who desire to join Israel are accepted. Although the passage allows for the admittance of outsiders into Israel, the main emphasis is on the means of membership in the community of Israel with a view to maintaining its religious purity. Indeed, that gentile incorporation is not explicitly stated suggests the author/redactor allows for the possibility, but it is not a central concern.

b) Ezra 4,1-5

This short passage provides further insight into the ideological stance of EN regarding the admittance of outsiders into Israel<sup>(45)</sup>. It

---

no evidence for any non-Christian Jewish community in antiquity accepting uncircumcised male converts.

<sup>(44)</sup> In particular, the relative importance of the Torah vis-à-vis the Temple and sacrifices is demonstrated in two ways. First, the reading of the Torah outside the Temple (Neh 8,1) indicates that 'the Torah was greater than the Temple and its sacrifices, indeed ... the Torah as such was above anything it might contain'; H.L. ELLISON, *From Babylon to Bethlehem. The Jewish People from the Exile to the Messiah* (Exeter, NH 1976) 47. Second, the placement of the reading of the Torah to parallel the presentation of sacrifices in Ezra 3, along with the rarity and speed of reporting of sacrifices suggests that the Torah replaces the offering of sacrifices; see T.C. ESKENAZI, "The Structure of Ezra-Nehemiah and the Integrity of the Book", *JBL* 107 (1988) 650.

<sup>(45)</sup> If Ezra 4–6 is a literary unit, then a rounded understanding of either 4,1-5 or 6,19-22 can only be achieved with reference to the other. For a comparison and contrast of 4,1-4 with 6,19-22, see H.C.M. VOGT, *Studie zur nachexilischen Gemeinde in Esra-Nehemia* (Werl 1966) 47-53, who outlines seven parallels. He concludes that the correspondences between the two passages define the outer limits of a literary unit. Building on the work of H.H.-MALLAU, "The Redaction of Ezra 4–6: A Plea for a Theology of Scribes", *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 15 (1988) 70-73, who finds parallel panels within Ezra 4–6, and without reference to

excludes from the temple building program those descended from mixed stock of former northern Israel and those peoples imported by the Assyrians (4,2)<sup>(46)</sup>. Although overlapping, the descriptions of Israel in this passage progressively refer more to geographical location than sociological grouping<sup>(47)</sup>. The first description of Israel as both ‘Judah and Benjamin’ (יהודה ובנימין) and ‘the returned exiles’ (בני הגולה); 4,1) appears redundant. Yet at the beginning of this episode, the association of the location-oriented ‘the returned exiles’ with ‘Judah and Benjamin’ raises the possibility that it might also be more than a social grouping<sup>(48)</sup>. The contrast of the opponents<sup>(49)</sup> in 4,4 with ‘the people of Judah’ (עם יהודה) then highlights the location of the people, since all Israel is involved in the rebuilding (4,1.3)<sup>(50)</sup>. The further description of the opponents in 4,6<sup>(51)</sup>, in contradistinction to ‘the in-

---

Vogt, S.C. MATZAL, “The Structure of Ezra iv-vi”, *VT* 50 (2000) 567-568, outlines parallels between Ezra 4,1-5 and 6,19-22. He also argues that these passages form a literary frame, and notes that they are nearly coincident with the Hebrew lingual frame (4,1-7 and 6,19-22) surrounding the Aramaic text (4,8-6,18).

<sup>(46)</sup> There is no biblical record of the population of northern Israel under Esarhaddon (681-669 B.C.E.; although cf. Isa 7,8). However, it is known from the so-called Prism A that he conquered Sidon and settled people there from the east. See *ANET*, 290. This is consistent with general Assyrian policy. See B. ODED, *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden 1979). Although BATTEN, *Ezra and Nehemiah* 125-126, identifies this group as the Samaritans, current scholarship dates the emergence of the Samaritans as a group to later in the Persian period, or to the Hellenistic period. See, e.g., WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 49.

<sup>(47)</sup> Most of the references to Judah in EN are geographical, rather than to the sociological grouping at the location (e.g., Ezra 1,2.3; 2,1; 5,1.8; 7,14; 10,7; Neh 1,2; 2,5.7; 4,10; 5,14; 6,7.18; 7,6; 11,3.20.25; 13,15). The references to Judah or Benjamin in EN as an Israelite tribal grouping are generally prefaced, e.g., with ‘the fathers’ houses of’ (Ezra 1,5), ‘the sons of’ (Ezra 3,9; Neh 11,4.25.31; 13,15), or ‘the house of’ (Neh 4,16).

<sup>(48)</sup> The two descriptions of Israel in 4,1 also outline the grounds for opposition with their adversaries, and form the basis of their subsequent rejection by the leaders of Israel in 4,3.

<sup>(49)</sup> They are called ‘the people of the land’ (עם הארץ), which probably includes the ‘adversaries’ in 4,1.

<sup>(50)</sup> This understanding is further strengthened if 4,4-5 is identified as a proleptic summary for 4,6-23. See MATZAL, “Structure”, 566. Pace S. TALMON, “Ezra and Nehemiah (Books and Men)”, *IDBSup* (ed. K. CRIM) (Nashville, TN 1976) 322, who views 4,4-5 as a ‘summary notation’, recapitulating the contents and delineating 3,1-4,3 as a textual unit.

<sup>(51)</sup> While this verse is best understood as part of a ‘flashforward’ (4,6-23), the subject matter closely follows that present in 4,4-5, which in turn is linked to

habitants of Judah and Jerusalem' (יְשֵׁבֵי יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַם), reinforces this topographical understanding<sup>(52)</sup>. Within EN, a specific catalogue of the settlements of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah is found in Neh 11,25-36<sup>(53)</sup>. Thus, the concern for geographical location in this passage implies that the adversaries were not the non-exiled Judeans.

At first glance, the grounds for rejecting the adversaries appear to be non-religious. They are refused participation on racial grounds: they are a mixed race, descended from those imported by the Assyrians and those remaining in the northern kingdom (4,2). Political expediency is an additional reason, since the decree of Cyrus to rebuild the temple was given to the returnees alone (1,1-4; 4,3). However, from the viewpoint of EN, the fundamental problem blocking their in-

---

4,1-3. See B. HALPERN, "A Historiographic Commentary on Ezra 1-6. Achronological Narrative and Dual Chronology in Israelite Historiography", *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (eds. B. HALPERN – W.H. PROPP – D.N. FREEDMAN) (Winona Lake, IN 1990) 108; WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 56-57.

<sup>(52)</sup> The specific location of the people of Israel in the areas of Judah, Benjamin and Jerusalem is consistent with the presentation in the rest of EN. Those listed by fathers' houses (Ezra 2,2-20; Neh 7,8-24) are likely to comprise the returnees who predominantly settled in Jerusalem, while those listed by location (Ezra 2,21-35; Neh 7,25-38) remained in the Judah and Benjamin during the exile, but were subsequently granted membership into Israel by the returnees (cf. Ezra 6,21). See JAPHET, "People", 111; J.P. WEINBERG, *The Citizen-Temple Community* (Sheffield 1992) 132; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "The Family in Persian Period Judah: Some Textual Reflections", *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past. Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina: Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools of Oriental Research Jerusalem, May 29-31, 2000* (eds. W.G. DEVER – S. GITIN) (Winona Lake, IN 2003) 479. Pace BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 85, who states that the division 'does not seem to have any significance'. Evidence for this understanding is found in the distribution of the towns: of the twenty towns, the majority are found within the border of Benjamin (twelve), three each in the region south of Jerusalem and in the Ono-Lod Valley, and two in the Jordan Valley; see O. LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem. Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Winona Lake, IN 2005) 157. The current archaeological data also suggest that the Babylonian deportations centred around Jerusalem, without extensive deportations from other areas of Judah and Benjamin; see LIPSCHITS, *Fall*, 164-165, 270-271.

<sup>(53)</sup> The catalogue is generally not understood by scholars to be historically accurate; rather, it intentionally harks back to the exodus-settlement pattern as found elsewhere in EN. For further discussion, see BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah* 328-30; WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 349-350, 353. Nonetheless, it still reveals the author/redactor's geographical focus.

clusion into 'Israel' would be their syncretism. 2 Kings 17 provides the background to the adversaries: they may seek YHWH, but they also worship other deities (2 Kgs 17,24-41). That is, they neither know YHWH nor seek him exclusively, in the way of 'Israel' (esp. 2 Kgs 17,41)<sup>(54)</sup>. This understanding is reinforced in EN by the contrast between the syncretists' reference to God ('your God'; אֱלֹהֵיכֶם) and the returnees' response ('YHWH, the God of Israel'; יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), which underscores their relative lack of intimacy with the deity (4,2-3)<sup>(55)</sup>. Within the ideological framework of EN, in which holiness and purity are paramount to reconstituted Israel, this syncretistic group would have been anathema.

Nonetheless, not all those remaining in Judah would have been accepted into 'Israel'. By the time of the exile, the religious practices of the indigenous Jerusalemites had become inconsistent with the standards of behaviour advocated by the prophets such as Ezekiel (e.g., Ezek 8), and adopted by many members of the Restoration community. It seems most likely that those living in the territory of Judah and Benjamin were also involved<sup>(56)</sup>. Only those who truly seek after YHWH are incorporated into 'Israel'<sup>(57)</sup>.

### 3. *Ezra 1–6 in the Ethno-theological Context of EN*

Overall, EN advocates a separatist policy towards gentiles. This is particularly prominent in the way the 'mixed marriage' problem is dealt with in Ezra 9–10, and then again in Neh 13,23-27. EN is primarily concerned with maintaining religious purity. Yet this functions

<sup>(54)</sup> It is most likely that the adversaries continued the same religious practices of the original colonists under Sargon; CLINES, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 73-74; BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 106-107.

<sup>(55)</sup> In the HB, YHWH is the personal name of Israel's God (cf. Exod 3,14-15).

<sup>(56)</sup> Other Jewish communities were involved in worshipping deities beside YHWH, such as at Elephantine in the fifth century B.C.E. See B. PORTEN, *Archives from the Elephantine*. The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony (Berkeley, CA 1968) 173-179.

<sup>(57)</sup> That some devoted followers become part of the community may be seen in the list of signatories in Neh 10,2-28[1-27]. Most of the priests and Levites are familiar from other lists, but MYERS, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 174-177, suggests that the majority of the lay leaders are different from those found in the lists of Ezra 2, Neh 7, and Ezra 8. He comments that the expanded list includes 'the growth of the community by the addition of those who had not gone into exile or who had returned to the land from hideouts during the Babylonian invasion'.

within a context of group identity liminality and a heightened sense of external threat<sup>(58)</sup>. The dilemma facing the returned exiles is deciding whether Israelite identity has a religious or genetic basis. This in turn may be influenced by political factors: the edict of Artaxerxes provides Ezra with a mandate to establish a religious community (Ezra 7,11-26)<sup>(59)</sup>.

In order to solve the dilemma the Torah is drawn upon for guidance. Yet this raises two problems: finding the relevant legislation; and applying it to a concrete situation. By comparing the return from Exile with the Exodus from Egypt, the author/editor of EN parallels the Mosaic restrictions on mixed marriages in Deut 7,1-5 with the current situation in Yehud<sup>(60)</sup>. By combining this with legislation from Lev 19, he produces an interpretation and application based solely on genetic purity. The possibility that a 'foreign wife' can be a follower of YHWH is not entertained<sup>(61)</sup>; to be a non-Israelite is to be involved in false worship.

Nonetheless, although the concern for genealogy dominates in EN, the religious component does not completely disappear. After all, the goal and climax of EN is the presentation of a holy community, joyfully worshipping YHWH (Neh 12,27-43)<sup>(62)</sup>. In this sense, the ultimate aim of genetic purity is religious purity<sup>(63)</sup>.

#### a) Nehemiah 10,29-30[28-29]

The location of Neh 10,29-30[28-29] towards the end of EN with its counterpart in Ezra 6,21 functions to 'bookend' the concept of gen-

<sup>(58)</sup> M.A. HOGG – D. ABRAMS, *Social Identifications. A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes* (London 1988) 77, suggest that ethnocentrism, or 'own-group-enhancing stereotypical differences', tend to be accentuated under conditions in which 'intergroup distinctiveness is perceived to be becoming eroded and insecure'.

<sup>(59)</sup> WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 160.

<sup>(60)</sup> Cf. W.J. DUMBRELL, "The Purpose of the Books of Chronicles", *JETS* 27 (1984) 259; JAPHET, "People", 112-113.

<sup>(61)</sup> Cf. WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 161.

<sup>(62)</sup> So, *inter alios*, CLINES, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 228; WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 376-377.

<sup>(63)</sup> Pace C.E. HAYES, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities. Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York, NY 2002), who adds the category 'genealogical impurity' to 'ritual' and 'moral' impurity. Since, using her categorization, moral purity would be the goal of genealogical purity, it would be better to understand genealogical purity as a subset of moral purity. For a discussion of distinct kinds of impurity, see also J. KLAUANS, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford 2000).

tile incorporation into Israel<sup>(64)</sup>. In Neh 10, those who comprise Israel are now identified as the rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants, and

כל הנבדל מעמי הארצות אל תורת האלהים

‘All who had separated from the peoples of the lands to follow the Torah of God’ (Neh 10,29[28]).

The inclusion of foreigners in this verse is the counterpart of Ezra 6,21:

כל הנבדל משמאח גוי הארץ אלהם לדרש ליהוה.

‘All who had separated from the uncleanness of the nations of the lands to worship YHWH’.

Reminiscent of Deuteronomy, the members of the Israelite covenant community pledge themselves to following the general (Neh 10,29-30) and specific stipulations (10,31-40) of ‘God’s law’ (cf. Deut 8,6; 28,15)<sup>(65)</sup>. Nonetheless, the community described in Neh 10,29[28] could be taken to exclude foreigners<sup>(66)</sup>. This understanding mainly derives from the beginning of Neh 9, which is linked to Neh 10 by the editorial phrase ‘in view of all this’ (ובכל זאת; 10,1)<sup>(67)</sup>. It states that the Israelites separated themselves from ‘all foreigners’ (בני נכר; Neh 9,2). However, two main factors militate against reading Neh 10,29 as a continuation of Neh 9,2.

First, in the current literary context, the separation is closely linked to what follows. The confession of sins and the iniquities of the fathers (ועוונות אבותיהם), followed by the recitation of Israelite history (Neh 9,2-37) is only pertinent for Israelites<sup>(68)</sup>, not foreigners<sup>(69)</sup>.

<sup>(64)</sup> As JAPHET, “People”, 115 observes, the usage of the phrase נבדל מן אל (“separated from ... to”) in Ezra 6,21 and Neh 10,29[28] is “an excellent definition of religious conversion: joining a new community for the sake of its faith and religious way of life, as outlined by its laws.” Cf. HALOT I, 110.

<sup>(65)</sup> D.J.A. CLINES, “Nehemiah 10 as an Example of Early Jewish Biblical Exegesis”, *JSOT* 21 (1981) 111. Clines outlines the exegetical moves behind the application of the law to the post-exilic context in Neh 10.

<sup>(66)</sup> E.g., F.C. FENSHAM, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (Grand Rapids, MI 1982) 238. Cf. WILLIAMSON, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 333.

<sup>(67)</sup> E.g., CLINES, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 200. Cf. D.J. MCCARTHY, “Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah”, *CBQ* 44 (1982) 34-36, who views the whole unit Neh 8–10 as a covenant renewal.

<sup>(68)</sup> The shift from their ancestors’ generation to the current generation occurs in 9,32, marked by the fourfold repetition of אֲנִינוּ (9,33.36a.36b.37). See D.A. GLATT-GILAD, “Reflections on the Structure and Significance of the ‘amānāh (Neh 10,29-40)”, *ZAW* 112 (2000) 393.

<sup>(69)</sup> BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 296.

They could not be expected to identify with the collective sin of Israel in the penitential prayer. Second, the Deuteronomic inspiration also extends to the participants of the covenant ceremony. The presence of assimilated foreigners in the Deuteronomic ceremony (Deut 29,9-15[10-16])<sup>(70)</sup> is a strong indication that they would also be involved in Neh 10. Since the passages promoting separation from gentiles dominate in EN, the presence of these two verses effectively functions as a tacit acknowledgement of the assimilationist view by the author/redactor of EN. Indeed, a strong ethnocentric tone comes to the fore again in the concluding chapter of EN (Neh 13).

\*  
\* \*

The Passover observance in Ezra 6,21 reinforces the ideological stance of EN towards 'outsiders'. Participation in the Passover functions to mark out those who are willing to separate themselves from 'the people of the land' and join with the community of Israel in following YHWH exclusively. As such, it functions as an identity marker that forms a boundary between Israel and non-Israel. While the bulk of EN constructs an almost impenetrable boundary for gentiles, this verse, along with its counterpart in Neh 10,29[28] hints that membership may be granted on religious, not just genealogical grounds.

Politically, a religious basis for membership in the Israelite community would have been useful for the redactor(s) of EN. The mandate given to the returnees was to establish a religious community. The acceptance of foreigners who conformed with the religious standards of the Restoration community would have been consistent with this mandate.

The acceptance of outsiders is also consistent with the general attitude towards the nature of lineage in the early Restoration period. As part of the transitional milieu of the time, there was a downplaying of genealogy as a factor in political leadership and social hierarchy. For instance, this is seen in the conflation of the scribe and the priest in the Second Temple period (e.g., Ezra), with the resultant qualifying factor being virtue and skill rather than heredity<sup>(71)</sup>. It is not until later

<sup>(70)</sup> BLENKINSOPP, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 314.

<sup>(71)</sup> See M. HIMMELFARB, *A Kingdom of Priests*. Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism (Philadelphia, PA 2006) 11; M. HIMMELFARB, "'A Kingdom of Priests': The Democratization of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism", *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997) 102.



in the Restoration period, when Israelite national identity becomes established, that emphasis is placed on genealogy once again<sup>(72)</sup>. Indeed, the stability of Israelite identity may have also been a factor contributing to the more open acceptance of outsiders<sup>(73)</sup>.

Sydney Missionary and Bible College  
43 Badminton Rd, Croydon 2132, Australia

Peter H.W. LAU

#### SUMMARY

In contrast to other texts dated to the post-exilic period, Ezra – Nehemiah is well known for its separatist policy towards gentiles. Two exceptions in EN are the possible participation of foreigners in the Passover ceremony (Ezra 6,19-21) and the community pledge to follow the Torah (Neh 10,29[28]). An examination of antecedent Passover celebrations reveals that participation in the Passover marks out those who are members of 'true' Israel. This article argues that these cases indeed exhibit an anomalous inclusiveness, and discusses how it can be understood within the wider ethno-theological thrust of EN.

<sup>(72)</sup> See Y. LEVIN, "From Lists to History: Chronological Aspects of the Chronicler's Genealogies", *JBL* 123 (2004) 601-636; Y. LEVIN, "Who Was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from His Genealogies", *JBL* 122 (2003) 229-245.

<sup>(73)</sup> For a discussion of the inclusive stance found in Chronicles, see, e.g., G.N. KNOPPERS, "Intermarriage, Social Complexity, and Ethnic Diversity in the Genealogy of Judah", *JBL* 120 (2001) 15-30.

## The Hebrew Word דממה and the Root *d-m-m* I ("To Be Silent") (\*)

The Hebrew word דממה has been the topic of scholarly interest for many years, not only due to the important passages in which it is found (especially the theophany Elijah experiences at Horeb), but also due to its ambiguous etymology and the complex nuances and semantic relationships between the various roots containing *daleth* and *mem*. Although recent dictionaries and studies of the word have proposed defining it as "sighing" or "whisper" and deriving it from the root *d-m-m* II associated with mourning and/or moaning, the present study demonstrates that the word actually denotes "silence, quiet" (or the absence of loud sound and motion) and should be derived from the root *d-m-m* I associated with silence. Evidence for this definition and etymology emerges from a close study of the biblical passages containing דממה, the usages of semantically similar Hebrew and Aramaic words in early rabbinic and Christian texts, and finally a consideration of how דממה is used among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

### 1. History of the Problem

The conventional understanding of the word דממה at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as represented in BDB, was that it denoted "whisper" and derived from the geminate root *d-m-m* (listed in BDB as *d-m-m* I), whose basic notion is translated "to be or grow dumb, silent, still". However, the difficulty of defining דממה is intimated in BDB's presentation: "(silence) whisper" (1). The problem would seem to be that

(\*) I thank the editors and readers of the present article for their helpful suggestions regarding the article's structure and organization. What infelicities of content and form remain are attributable to me.

(1) This two-fold translation reflects the word's interpretation in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century. Gesenius's *Thesaurus* defines the word as "*silentium*", W. GESENIUS, *Thesaurus philologicus linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaee Veteris Testamenti* (Leipzig 1835-1853) s.v. Robinson's translation reflects most of the entry: "*silence, stillness*, e.g., of the winds, *a calm* Ps 107,29 . . . *a voice of stillness*, i.e. still gentle, 1 K. 19,12. So poet. by Hendiadys, Job 4,16 . . . *I hear stillness and a voice* i.e. a still voice, light whisper. Sept. and Vulg. *lenis aura*, gentle breeze", *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament including the Biblical Chaldaee*. From the Latin of William Gesenius (trans. E. ROBINSON) (Boston

the root from which it derives indicates lack of sound, while the word itself (in some passages, at least) denotes a slight sound. As a solution to this asymmetry, philologists and others have proposed various etymologies. G.V. Schick connected it to a root *d-m-m* “to mutter, whisper”; G.R. Driver defined it as “the muttering or rumbling of a rising or falling storm . . . and the whisper of a ghostly voice” and connected it with *d-m-m* “to moan, speak in whispers”; though J. Lust believes it actually means “roaring”; Dale Allison, writing specifically about the occurrences of the word in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400-407, Mas1k, 11Q17), claims it should mean “absolute silence”; M. Masson, writing especially in relation to 1 Kgs 19,12 and the theophany at Horeb, also believes it means silence; while I. Knohl believes it is rather “a very quiet voice”<sup>(2)</sup>. Even more recent dictionaries do not agree with each other: KB<sup>3</sup> translates “motionless, calm (cessation of any strong movement of air)” and derive it from *d-m-m* “to be motionless, stand still”, while DCH translate “whisper, sighing, (low) rumbling, perh[aps] silence, calm of sea”. More than anyone in the recent past, B.A. Levine has presented a careful examination of the related roots; he proposes defining דממה as “sighing” and deriving it from a root he identifies as *d-m-m* II (“to mourn, moan”)<sup>(3)</sup>.

<sup>20</sup>1872) s.v. His translation does not note, however, the alternative suggestion for Job 4,16 “*nisi malevi: silentium erat et vocem audiui*” (GESENIUS, *Thesaurus*, s.v.).

<sup>(2)</sup> G.V. SCHICK, “The Stems *dûm* and *damâm* in Hebrew”, *JBL* 32 (1913) 239; G.R. DRIVER, “A Confused Hebrew Root (דום, דמה, דמם)”, [*Sefer Tur-Sinai: ma’amarim be-heker ha-Tanakh*]: *mugash li-khevod ha-Prof. N.H.Tur-Sinai li-melot lo shivi’im shanah* (eds. M. HARAN – T. LURIA) (Jerusalem 1960) 4\*; J. LUST, “A Gentle Breeze or a Roaring Thunderous Sound? Elijah at Horeb: 1Kings XIX 12”, *VT* 25 (1975) 110-115; D.C. ALLISON, “Silence of the Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice”, *RevQ* 13/49-52 (1988) 193-195; M. MASSON, “L’expérience mystique du prophète Eli: ‘Qol d’mama daqqa’”, *RHR* 208 (1991) 243 and idem, *Élie ou l’appel du silence* (Paris 1992) 20; I. KNOHL, “Between Voice and Silence: The relationship between Prayer and Temple cult”, *JBL* 115 (1996) 24. More citations might be added; for instance, A. LIEBER, “Voice and Vision: Song as a Vehicle for Ecstatic Experience, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*”, *Of Scribes and Sages. Early Jewish Interpretation of Scripture* (ed. C.A. EVANS) (London – New York 2004) II, 51-58. And, P. TORRESAN, “Dumah, Demamah e Dumiyah: Il silenzio e l’esperienza del sacro nella bibbia ebraica”, *BeO* 47 (2004) 85-101, explores the various nuances of silence in the Bible and the words, like דממה, that are used to denote it, though he does not attempt a philological analysis of the words and their cognates.

<sup>(3)</sup> B.A. LEVINE, “Silence, Sound, and the Phenomenology of Mourning in Biblical Israel”, *JANES* 22 (1993) 101-103.

Levine's discussion of the word is part of a more general treatment of the roots associated with it in Biblical Hebrew and in other cognate languages like Ugaritic, Akkadian, and the Semitic dialect of Ebla where a root with the consonants *d-m-m* occurs with the meaning "to mourn". His study demonstrates beyond any doubt that a similar root existed in Biblical Hebrew; he concludes that there are two basic homonymous roots in Biblical Hebrew: *d-m-m* I (which is realized in the Masoretic vocalization as *d-m-m*, *d-w-m*, or *d-m-y*) and *d-m-m* II. The root *d-m-m* I represents cessation and the total absence of motion and sound (and perhaps also ruin and destruction), while *d-m-m* II represents mourning, moaning, and, by extension, other "sounds which are reminiscent of mourning" (4). He argues that "the notion of 'mourning, moaning' [associated with *d-m-m* II] is differentiated in biblical usage from 'stillness, silence, cessation' [associated with *d-m-m* I] and that it operates in different contexts" (5).

Part of Levine's approach is to assume that the root *d-m-m* I does not represent muttering or speaking in a low voice, but rather total silence and stillness. This logical position then leads him to question the derivation of any word which has, in the past, been derived from *d-m-m* I and which also occurs in the context of speech or sound. He discusses this first in relation to Ezek 24,16-23 and especially the phrase at the beginning of verse 17:

הֶאֱנַק דָּם מִתִּים אֲבֵל לֹא-תִשְׁעַשׂ

Levine notes that if *d-m-m* I only denotes the total absence of sound and motion, then the translation offered by the NJPS "moan softly" for הֶאֱנַק דָּם "produces an oxymoron" (6). A similar problem

(4) LEVINE, "Phenomenology of Mourning", 106. This neat and straightforward etymology seems more appealing than the greatly more complicated etymologies made by past scholars like DRIVER ("A Confused Hebrew Root", 11\*), who proposed four separate roots, and a total of seven separate verbs derived from these. Levine's study proposes to find the root *d-m-m* II ("to mourn, moan") in various passages, including Lev 10,3; Isa 23,2; Ezek 24,17; Amos 5,13; Ps 4,5; Lam 2,10.

(5) LEVINE, "Phenomenology of Mourning", 91. He also writes that "stillness and silence, on the one hand, and moaning and similar sounds, on the other, are indeed distinguished from each other in Biblical Hebrew (ibid.).

(6) A similar problem would, it seems, adhere to the translation of the NIB ("groan quietly"), NAB ("groan in silence") and the NJB ("groan in silence"). By "oxymoron", I believe, LEVINE, "Phenomenology of Mourning", 10, means a non-sensical phrase, not a rhetorical flourish. Levine writes that if one were to understand דָּם here as from *d-m-m* I "[o]ne would have to translate: 'Moan in

pertains to two of the three biblical passages where the word דממה occurs: 1 Kgs 19,12 and Job 4,16.

Levine translates the phrase from Job 4,16 that includes דממה as “droning voice” (דממה וקול) and considers that “a derivation from *d-m-m* II might be more accurate”<sup>(7)</sup>. He bases this conclusion on a consideration of the context, a consideration of the Septuagint translation “breeze and voice” (αὔρα καὶ φωνή), and the fact that the Akkadian cognate *damāmu* indicates the sound of wind blowing through reeds. Similarly, context and the Septuagint’s translation of דממה with αὔρα in Ps 107,29 suggests that the NJPS translation “whisper” is correct<sup>(8)</sup>. He suggests that these two biblical usages help to explain the perplexing קול דממה דקה of 1 Kgs 19,12.

## 2. The Word דממה in the Bible

In the Bible, the word occurs in only three passages, which I translate below in order to make explicit how I understand them:

11. He said, “Go out, stand on the mountain before the Lord, since, lo, the Lord is (about to) cross (before it). A great, strong wind was breaking up mountains and shattering rocks before the Lord. The Lord was not in the wind. After the wind (there came) an earthquake; the Lord was not in the earthquake. After the earthquake (came) fire. The Lord was not in the fire. 12. After the fire (came) a sound of gentle quiet (דממה). 13. When Elijah heard it, he wrapped his face in his cloak ... (1Kgs 19,11-13)<sup>(9)</sup>.

---

silence””. LEVINE, “Phenomenology of Mourning”, 100, instead, proposes reading דם as a noun “lament” in construct with the following “dead” or reading דם as an imperative from *d-m-m* II (“to mourn, moan”) and translating: “Groan! Moan!”.

<sup>(7)</sup> LEVINE, “Phenomenology of Mourning”, 101-102.

<sup>(8)</sup> LEVINE, “Phenomenology of Mourning”, 102, agrees with the NJPS translation of דממה as “whisper” since “All motion did not stop at once; there was a breeze that was audible, after which the waves fell silent”. I fail to see how the context of this verse implies that all motion did not cease suddenly. In accord with the NJPS translation, the NIB translates “whisper” and the NAB “murmur”. By contrast, the NJB translates as “calm” and the NRSV with a verbal phrase: “be still”.

<sup>(9)</sup> Translations are my own, unless stated otherwise. Scholars interpret the phrase containing דממה in different ways. J.T. WALSH, *1Kings* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry; Collegeville, MN 1996) 276, suggests that the phrase in 1 Kgs 19,12 is an oxymoron, paradoxical in the way that the related phrase “silence and sound” is in Job 4,16: “The numinous power of the image lies precisely in our inability to grasp it — a quality utterly lost by translations that render it ‘a thin, whispering sound’ or the like”. R.D. NELSON,

They cried to the Lord in their distress,  
 and he delivered them from their anguish.  
 He turned the storm to calm (דממה),  
 and the waves grew silent (Ps 107,28-29)<sup>(10)</sup>.  
 A spirit passed by my face,  
 it bristled the hair of my skin.  
 It stood (still), but I could not see its shape.  
 A (vague) form was before my eyes;  
 I could hear a quiet (דממה) voice (Job 4,15-16)<sup>(11)</sup>.

As illustrated above, part of the argument for understanding דממה as “sighing” or “whisper” is the discrepancy between the assumed meaning of *d-m-m* I (absolute silence or stillness) and the context of at least two of the above biblical passages that describe a slight sound or voice (1 Kgs 19,12 and Job 4,16). Like other scholars, I too assume that *d-m-m* I (together with דממה) indicates absolute silence or stillness. However, this does not preclude the root’s use (or the use of דממה) in

---

*First and Second King* (Interpretation, Atlanta, GA 1987) 123-125, on the other hand, asserts that there is no theological import to the phrase or the apparent word play. See also those studies mentioned above, especially in relation to 1 Kgs 19,12: LUST, “A Gentle Breeze or a Roaring Thunderous Sound?”, 110-115; MASSON, “L’expérience mystique du prophète Eli”, 243 and idem, *Élie ou l’appel du silence*, 20.

<sup>(10)</sup> E. DHORME, *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (London 1967) 51, commenting on Job 4,16, finds in this psalmic verse clear indication of דממה’s meaning: “In Ps 107,29, the noun דממה certainly means the calm which succeeds the storm: silence and peace”. Other commentators translate the word as “murmur”: J.W. ROGERSON – J.W. MCKAY, *Psalms: 101-150* (CBC; Cambridge 1977) 53, or “whisper”: M. DAHOOD, *Psalms III: 101-150* (AB 17A; Garden City, NY 1970) 79.

<sup>(11)</sup> DHORME, *Commentary on the Book of Job*, 51-52, recognizing that “most commentators see in דממה וקול a hendiadys ‘murmur and voice,’” bases his own analysis on the meaning of דממה in Ps 107,29 (“silence”) and its usage in 1 Kgs 19,12 where it modifies קול; he writes of Job 4,16: “The most objective translation of the last hemistich is therefore simply: ‘And I hear a whispered voice’”. R. GORDIS, *The Book of Job. Commentary, New Translation, and Special Studies* (New York 1978) 42, also understands דממה to mean “silence” here, but detaches it from וקול, to translate: “a form stood before my eyes; silence — then I heard a voice”. He explains: “The pausal vocalization with Qames links דממה to וקול, while the accentuation joins it to אשמע” (ibid., 50). Pope and Whybray understand the syntax similarly. M.H. POPE, *Job* (AB 15; Garden City, NY 1965) 37, comments “the meaning of the word is ‘stillness, silence’”. N. WHYBRAY, *Job* (Readings; Sheffield 1998) 43, translates: “the silence followed by a voice speaking”. N.C. HABEL, *The Book of Job* (CBC; Cambridge 1975) 28, on the other hand, translates: “and I heard the sound of a low voice”.

association with words that denote sound or speech. There are, in fact, precedents for words that denote silence modifying verbs of speech in post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic<sup>(12)</sup>. For example, in rabbinic Hebrew, one finds *התקינו שיהיו אומרים אותו בחשאי* "they enacted that it should be recited quietly" and the same phrase in Aramaic *לה בחשאי אמרי* (13). Other examples are found in the Aramaic of Targum Jonathan (Isa 26,16) and in Syriac literature (14). The passage from the Targum to Isa 26,16, translates the Hebrew noun *לחש*.

... דווּ מלפין אלפן אוריתך בחשאי  
 ... they taught the instruction of your law quietly (15).

In addition, Targum Jonathan also attests similar usages in the passages that translate 1 Kgs 19,12 and Ezek 24,17. The Hebrew to these passages includes *דממה* and *דם*, respectively, but these passages are presented not in order to illustrate how the biblical passages were rendered in the various versions, rather in order to demonstrate how a word or root associated with silence can modify a word associated with sound or speech.

(12) This is not related to the cases where "silence" seems to be a speechlessness, as in Ps 32,3: "While I kept silence (*החרשתי*), my body wasted away through my groaning all day long" (NRSV).

(13) These passages from the Babylonian Talmud (b. Pes 56a) recount the confusion over whether or not one should conclude the *shema* with a particular blessing attributed to Jacob, but which Moses did not record, *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (trans. H. FREEDMAN) (London 1967) V, 279. It is clear that the root *h-š-y* denotes silence in Hebrew and Aramaic from other passages in the Talmuds: b. Hag 12b and 13b (Hebrew) and y. AZ 39b (13) (Aramaic). The phrase *בחסאי* "quietly" is also found in Tannaitic Hebrew, though not in the context of speech or sound (e.g., t. Sheq 2,16). A similar expression, *בשתיקה*, with the same meaning, is also found more frequently, though again not in the context of speech (e.g., m. Zev 2,4).

(14) In Syriac the word *ܕܡܡܐ* is translated by J.P. SMITH, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Founded upon the *Thesaurus Syriacus* of R. Payne Smith (Oxford 1903) s.v.: "silent, quiet; quietly, noiselessly, in a low voice". Other examples from Syriac include "quiet, tearless weeping" *ܕܡܡܐ ܕܡܡܐ* (cited SMITH, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, sub *ܕܡܡܐ*). Similarly, *ܕܡܡܐ* is used in the Peshitta to indicate *tranquille* (Lev 25,18, 19, 2 Sam 3,27, Isa 8,6), *in quiete* (Job 4,13; Ps 4,10) (ibid.). Also cited in the *Thesaurus Syriacus* (sub *ܕܡܡܐ*) is the phrase *ܕܡܡܐ ܕܡܡܐ* defined as "*soni quieti* h. e. *submissi*", i.e., "quiet, gentle sounds" (quoted from Ephrem's Hymns on the Heresies, no. 40).

(15) The Aramaic text is taken from A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*. Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts (Leiden 1962) III, 50.

ובתוך משרית מלאכי אִישָׁתָא קַל דַּמְשַׁבְּחִין בַּחֲשִׁי  
 . . . and after the camp of fiery angels (there was)  
 a sound of those praising quietly<sup>(16)</sup>.  
 אִידְנָק שְׁתוּק עַל מִיתָךְ  
 Sigh quietly over your dead . . .<sup>(17)</sup>.

The meaning of these Aramaic phrases seems clear. In the second passage, the verb שָׁתַק is used in hendiadys with another coordinate or appositional verb, as it is in other texts, like the Palestinian Targums to Exod 14,13 and 15,3<sup>(18)</sup>. It should be clear that the roots in Aramaic *h-š-y* and *š-t-q* are primarily associated with lack of sound but are used to modify verbs associated with speech or verbal expression. Neither in the Targum to Ezekiel, nor in the other passages cited above does one sense a degree of irony or *double entendre*. It seems, rather, that qualifying a noun or verb (which represents a sound) with another word connected with silence is one way of indicating a quiet sound or voice; it does not produce an oxymoron<sup>(19)</sup>. One might still wonder, however, if these post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic usages derive from a misreading of the original Biblical Hebrew idiom; I think this is unlikely, since the post-biblical usages are attested rather broadly in the Babylonian Talmud, in the Targums, and in Syriac literature.

<sup>(16)</sup> The Aramaic text is taken from A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic* (Leiden 1992) II, 261. Cited approvingly by ALLISON, "Silence of Angels", 196, G. Vermes' translation of this verse ("those who bless silently") assumes a literal understanding of the words, but this seems to ignore the Aramaic idiom — G. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth<sup>2</sup> 1975) 210-211. D.J. HARRINGTON — A.J. SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*. Introduction, Translation, and Notes (The Aramaic Bible 10; Edinburgh 1987) 254, translate בַּחֲשִׁי "softly", but derive the word from "a root meaning 'stir (a pot)'"'. Presumably, the root they refer to is שָׁשַׁת. As C.A. DRAY, *Translation and Interpretation in the Targum to the Books of Kings* (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 5; Leiden 2006) 63, has recently remarked, this etymology for בַּחֲשִׁי seems unlikely. Like her, I think that the phrase is rather clearly derived from *h-š-y*.

<sup>(17)</sup> The Aramaic text is taken from SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic*, III, 322.

<sup>(18)</sup> See M.L. KLEIN, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Cincinnati 1986) I, 222-225, 242-243. Although Klein translates the phrases קִימוּ וּשְׁתַּקּוּ and קִימוּ וּשְׁתַּקּוּ literally ("arise, be still" and "arise and be still"), he notes in relation to the first that "'stand quietly' might be better" (ibid., II, 62).

<sup>(19)</sup> In English, therefore, the best word to translate these Hebrew and Aramaic words is not "silence", which is more closely associated with complete lack of sound or motion, but rather with "quiet", which more often is applied to the absence of noise or agitated movement.



Given the evidence presented above, it may be assumed that the root *d-m-m* I (“to be silent”) can occur even in the context of sound and speech. Therefore, the word דם in Ezek 24,17 need not be construed as derived from *d-m-m* II (“to mourn, moan”). In fact, deriving it from *d-m-m* II would produce further confusion to the Hebrew text, since that would mean that the prophet is encouraging his audience not to mourn, but rather to moan by using a verb that also means “to mourn”. The fact that words for silence can modify words associated with speech and sound also suggests that דממה, even where it occurs in the context of sounds (1Kgs 19,12 and Job 4,16), can nevertheless be understood to denote “the absence of noise or agitated motion” and be derived from *d-m-m* I (“to be silent”).

It should also be pointed out, in passing, that although the Septuagint does translate דממה with words that denote a whisper or breeze, the Targums translate with words that denote silence or the absence of sound and motion. In addition to the translation of דממה by חשי״ cited above from the Targum to 1 Kgs 19,12, the Hebrew word is translated by חשי״ in Job 4,16 and by שחיקותא in Ps 107,29<sup>(20)</sup>.

### 3. The Word דממה among the Dead Sea Scrolls

The word דממה is found much more frequently in the Dead Sea Scrolls. According to *The Dead Sea Scroll Concordance* the word occurs in 13 different passages<sup>(21)</sup>; this does not include two attestations in the 1QIsaiah scroll which are cited in *DCH*. Among these, only two (4Q418 34, 3 [4QInstruction]; 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII, 5)<sup>(22)</sup> are

<sup>(20)</sup> The Targumic passages: יקום עלעולא לשחיקותא (Ps 107,29) and פתן אשמע (Job 4,16). Note, however, the Targums to Psalms and Job are in a dialect of Aramaic (Late Jewish Literary Aramaic) that is chronologically later than that of 1 Kgs. On the Targum to Psalms, see E.M. COOK, “The Psalms Targum: Introduction to a New Translation, with Sample Texts”, *Targum and Scripture. Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation in Memory of Ernest G. Clarke* (ed. P.V.M. FLESHER) (Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture 2; Leiden 2002) 185-201.

In Syriac, on the other hand, the translations are somewhat more free. The Latin, like the Greek, supposes an understanding of דממה as a breeze or gentle wind.

<sup>(21)</sup> M.G. ABEGG et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scroll Concordance* (Leiden 2003) s.v. There are actually 14 entries in the concordance, two of these (from 4Q401 16, 2 and 4Q402 9, 3) represent versions of the same text.

<sup>(22)</sup> Note that the passage לם ורחה עורף קשה לדממ״, listed as 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII, 5 in the *Dead Sea Scroll Concordance*, is found in Abegg’s edition of the *Hodayot*,

from contexts too damaged to provide any information on the word's meaning and use. This leaves 13 attestations. One of these is found in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIII, 18:

ואתה אלי תשיב {נפשי} סערה לדממה ונפש אביון פלטה כ...  
 You, my God, turned storm to calm (דממה),  
 the soul of the poor you have delivered<sup>(23)</sup>.

This passage is based on Ps 107,29 where דממה also occurs. As in Psalm 107, the context of 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIII, 18 points to a meaning for דממה that contrasts with “storm” (סערה); “calm, quiet” seems the most likely and encourages derivation from *d-m-m* I.

Another usage of דממה from the Hodayot is not directly linked to a biblical passage. In 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIV, 23 the motif is again of a sailor battered by storm; the text reads:

גליהם וכול משבריהם אלי המו רוח עושים [לאין] דממה להשיב נפש  
 Their waves and all their breakers over me rage,  
 a whirlwind [without] pause (דממה) to recover breath<sup>(24)</sup>.

As in 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIII, 18, the whirlwind is being contrasted with its opposite; the context points to a meaning like “quiet”, “pause”, or “stillness”, in essence, the absence of motion and noise. Meanings such as “whisper”, “rumbling”, or “sighing” do not make sense in this context; there is no implication that דממה represents a “slight sound” or a situation where the water is only partially still. The only reasonable derivation is from the root *d-m-m* I.

The same denotation and derivation of the word are suggested in one of the passages from the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> XXXIX, 23 [Isa 47,5]), where דממה replaces דָּמָם (defined by most scholars as “silence, stillness”) in the Masoretic text. Kutscher believed that it was due to דָּמָם's obscurity at the time of the scroll's being copied out that the scribe wrote דממה<sup>(25)</sup>. The context clearly points to the meaning “quiet, stillness” and the root *d-m-m* I:

but not in other editions. See M. ABEGG, “Hodayot and Hodayot-Like Texts”, *Poetic and Liturgical Texts* (eds. D.W. PARRY – E. TOV) (The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 5; Leiden 2005) 12 = [DSSR 5, 12].

<sup>(23)</sup> The Hebrew text is based on DSSSE, 172. The text in brackets represents the erasure of the word.

<sup>(24)</sup> DSSSE, 176 and DSSR 5, 36.

<sup>(25)</sup> E.Y. KUTSCHER, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)* (STDJ 6; Leiden 1974) 371. Kutscher's assumption seems to be that דממה does not mean silence; he remarks that in Isa 47,5 it “does not fit the context”, and then, after citing the translations in Symmachus and the Targum

5. . . . שבי דממה ובואי  
 בחושך בת כשדיים כיא לוא תוסיפי וקראו לך גבורת ממלכות  
 Sit quietly, and go  
 into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans,  
 for you will no longer (hear) that they call you the might of kingdoms  
 (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> XXXIX, 23 [Isa 47,5])<sup>(26)</sup>.

Understanding דממה to mean “whisper” or “sighing” again does not make sense in this passage. The other attestation in the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> XXVII, 3 [Isa 33,3]) results perhaps from scribal error, rather than from lexical obscurity. The Masoretic text has מרוממתך and the 1QIsaiah version has מדממתך; the versions support the reading of the Masoretic text<sup>(27)</sup>.

In two other cases (4Q401 16, 2 = 4Q402 9, 3 [4QShirSabb] and 4Q417 2 I, 3 [formerly labeled 4Q417 1, I; 4QInstruction]) the word occurs in a prepositional phrase modifying a verb of speech.

[י] שמיעו בדמ[מת] and [י] שמיעו בדממה /  
 they announce in the stillness of (4Q401 16, 2) . . .  
 They announce in the sti[llness of] (4Q402 9, 3)<sup>(28)</sup>.

והם אף רוחו לא תבלע כיא בדממה דברת[ה]  
 Also, do not confuse (lit., swallow) his spirit,  
 because yo[u] speak quietly (בדממה) (4Q417 2 I, 3)<sup>(29)</sup>.

It is important that this phrasing is found in two unrelated texts, since, as will be emphasized below, the language of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400-407, Mas1k, 11Q17) contains many peculia-

(both of which translate with a word meaning “silence”), he suggests the word is perhaps a defective spelling of the word דיממה (ibid.).

<sup>(26)</sup> The Hebrew text is from D.W. PARRY – E. QIMRON, *The Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>). A New Edition (STDJ 32; Leiden 1999) 79.

<sup>(27)</sup> See KUTSCHER, *Isaiah Scroll*, 228. The Hebrew text to this passage reads in D.W. PARRY – E. QIMRON, *The Great Isaiah Scroll*, 55: עמים מדממתך נפצו גוים מקול המון גדרו.

<sup>(28)</sup> The texts and translations are from C.A. NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, *Qumran Cave 4, VI. Poetic and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (eds. E. ESHEL et al.) (DJD 11; Oxford 1998) 210, 235. The same author has also presented her transcriptions (as well as translations and commentary) in C.A. NEWSOM, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta, GA 1985) and in C.A. NEWSOM, *Angelic Liturgy. Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 4B; Tübingen – Louisville, KY 1999).

<sup>(29)</sup> Text from J. STRUGNELL – D.J. HARRINGTON, *Qumran Cave 4, XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction* (Mûsār lē Mēvîn): 4Q415 ff. (DJD 34; Oxford 1999) 172.

rities. From the more fragmentary context of 4Q401 16, 2 = 4Q402 9, 3 we learn primarily that דממה occurs in the context of speech, presumably where the word is in construct with another word<sup>(30)</sup>. In 4Q417 2 I, 3 we have a bit more context. The prepositional phrase בדממה has been translated by other scholars as “in whisper”, “calmly”, “in silence (calmness)”<sup>(31)</sup>. Although one might take this as an evidence of דממה’s connotation of audible sound, it is not necessarily the case that it must mean “whisper” or something akin to this. As demonstrated above, a word meaning “silence” in the context of a verb indicating speech qualifies the notion conveyed by the verb; and, specific parallels to the syntax of the preposition *b* + a word for silence are found in the passages cited above. For these occurrences as well, דממה may be understood as from *d-m-m* I and understood to mean the absence of sound and motion.

The rest of the occurrences of דממה appear in construct phrases in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Two of these (4Q405 18, 3 and 5) are from fragmentary contexts<sup>(32)</sup>. These phrases are difficult to interpret, in part due to the fragmentary nature of the scrolls, but also due to the convoluted sense and syntax of the whole text. These convolutions present problems for interpreting even passages that are well preserved<sup>(33)</sup>. Syntactic confusion derives from (among other

<sup>(30)</sup> The *rectum* word might be קול (“voice” or “sound”), אלהים (“God” or “divine beings”), שקט (“silence”), or ברכה (“blessing”); all occur as the *rectum* word, preceded by the construct form of דממה. The word ברכה is defined as a masculine “by-form of ברכה” by NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, 353.

<sup>(31)</sup> These translations are, respectively, those of G. VERMES, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London 2004) 428; DSSSE, 855; STRUGNELL – HARRINGTON, *Qumran Cave 4, XXIV*, 176. Strugnell and Harrington ask in their comment to this passage “in silence or *sotto voce*?” (ibid., 179).

<sup>(32)</sup> These read, respectively, [קו]דשים ברוח דממה אלהים [ם] and [ול] [ול] פלא בדממה [ול] [ול]. NEWSOM, *Angelic Liturgy*, 91, translates these “[hol]ines with the quiet divin[e] spirit of godlike being[s]” and “wondrous [ps]alms with the quiet so[und]” (NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, 338). She presents better translations in a subsequent publication “[ho]lines with the quiet spirit of godlike being[s]” and “[ps]alms of wonder with a quiet so[und]”. It might be observed that the second phrase reverses the more common combination in the *Songs* where דממה usually follows (and modifies) קול. It is hard to be certain of any interpretation in 4Q405 18, 5, but, given the frequency of the reverse combination of words, this might be a case of an exegetical construct.

<sup>(33)</sup> An example of this convolution is found in 4Q403 1 I, 32-33: “Because in the splendor of praises (is) the glory of heaven (lit., his kingdom מלכותו); in it (i.e., heaven) are the praises of all the divine ones, together with the splendor of hea[ven] (lit., his kingdom מלכותו)”. The Hebrew reads:

כי בהדר חשבחות כבוד מלכותו בה חשבחות כול / אלהים עם הדר כול מלכותו

things) the extended construct phrases that include three or more words, all the words in construct with each other. The other occurrences of דממה all occur in these extended phrases:

מחתה לד[בירי] הפלא קול דממת שקט אל[והי]ם מברכים  
from underneath their wondrous s[hrines] (comes) a sound of  
quiet stillness, god-like beings blessing (4Q405 19ABCD, 7) <sup>(34)</sup>.

קול דממת אלהים / [שמע] וחמון רנה ברים כנפיהם קול [דממת]ת אלהים  
A sound of divine stillness / [is heard;] and there is a tumult  
of jubilation at the lifting up of their wings, a sound of divine  
[stillness]s (4Q405 20-21-22 II, 7-8) <sup>(35)</sup>.

וקול דממת ברכ בהמקן לכתם והלל-ו קודש בהשיב דרכיהם  
There is a still sound of blessing in the tumult of their movement a holy  
praise as they return on their paths (4Q405 20-21-22 II, 12) <sup>(36)</sup>.

A similar phrase is found in 4Q405 20-21-22 II, 13:

קול גילות רנה השקטים ודממת[ת] ברך אלהים בכל מחני אלהים  
The sound of glad rejoicing falls silent, and there is a still[ness] of  
divine blessing in all the camps of the god-like beings <sup>(37)</sup>.

The meanings of the first four phrases (in 4Q405 19ABCD, 7; 4Q405 20-21-22 II, 7, 8, 12) seem to be interconnected; they seem to be based on the phrase from 1 Kgs 19,12, קול דממה דקה. It seems likely that they presume a syntax for דממה similar to that in the biblical passage. That is, just like in the 1 Kgs passage, the last word modifies the middle word, which, in turn, modifies the first word; the only distinction between the passages from *Songs* and that from 1 Kgs 19,12 is that the *Songs*' passages employ a three-part construct chain, while the 1 Kgs passage uses a normal, two-part construct chain + an adjective <sup>(38)</sup>. As with the other passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the

<sup>(34)</sup> Text and translation from NEWSOM, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat", 339, 341. Note that the syntactic relationship of דממה implied in her translations differs in these passages. In the first passage, דממה modifies the following words, שקט and ברך (respectively), while in the two middle phrases דממה modifies the preceding word.

<sup>(35)</sup> Text and translation from NEWSOM, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat", 345, 347.

<sup>(36)</sup> Text and translation from NEWSOM, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat", 345, 347.

<sup>(37)</sup> Text and translation from NEWSOM, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat", 345, 347.

<sup>(38)</sup> If the assumption is correct that these passages are based on a syntactic understanding of the passage from 1 Kgs 19,12, then the translation "still sound of blessing" for קול דממת ברכ seems a bit too free; we would expect, rather, "sound of blessed stillness" or "sound of blessing stillness". Following this line of interpretation, the non-biblical word ברכ would be interpreted as an abstract noun qualifying the preceding word דממה, just as שקט (also an abstract noun) does in 4Q405 19ABCD, 7. This phrase from 4Q405 20-21-22 II, 12 parallels another following

usage of דממה in these passages allows a derivation from *d-m-m* I. Nevertheless, we should look more closely at these passages since they are so numerous.

At first glance, it would seem that they offer evidence for the meaning “murmur” or “sighing” for דממה. This is for two reasons: first, the word דממה occurs immediately after קול, apparently modifying קול as an adjectival genitive; second, the word דממה occurs once in construct with another word for silence, שקט. The first of these reasons is not as clear-cut as it might first appear. As we have already observed, words meaning silence can modify verbs of speech; it seems likely, therefore, that words denoting an absence of sound (especially loud sounds) can modify nouns that denote sound. The second reason is a bit more complicated. In 4Q405 19ABCD, 7, we find דממה שקט; following the syntax of the 1 Kgs passage, שקט should (most likely) be modifying the preceding דממה, which is modifying the preceding קול. In this context, the alternative understandings of דממה seem more likely; translations like “quiet sighing” or “quiet whisper” are not redundant. Although this is the case, one should take into account the context of these phrases before using them as evidence for the meaning “whisper” or “sighing”. The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* is full of redundancies; the most relevant are those that set two near synonyms in construct with each other. Note, for example, “He will n[o]t show compassion in the dominion of the fury (עברה) of his annihila[ting wra]th (חרון)” (4Q405 23 I, 12)<sup>(39)</sup>. Given such subtle use of vocabulary, we might hypothesize that the qualification of דממה by שקט implies that the sense of דממה in this passage is the absence of agitated motion<sup>(40)</sup>.

We may now summarize what has been discovered about דממה in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The word occurs in contexts where it cannot mean “sighing” or “murmuring” or denote a “low sound”, but rather

---

phrase, “still[ness] of divine blessing”, which suggests a connection between stillness and divinity, which, in turn, presumes a connection to 1 Kgs 19,12 and/or Job 4,16.

<sup>(39)</sup> The translation is that of NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, 357. The Hebrew reads:

ל[ו]א ירחם בממשלת עברת כל[ו]ת חרון[ו] psalm of praisesong” (NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, 245); סליחת רחמי עולמים “eternal compassionate forgiveness” (NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, 178). Even more obvious redundancies occur with words derived from the same root, as in 4Q403 1 I, 33: “exalt his exaltedness to exalted heaven” (NEWSOM, “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat”, 271).

<sup>(40)</sup> This is the understanding of the phrase implicit in Newsom’s translation.

must mean “the absence of noise or agitated motion” (1QH<sup>a</sup> XIV, 23 and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> XXXIX, 23 [Isa 47,5]). In a third passage, the most likely meaning is also absence of agitated motion (1QH<sup>a</sup> XIII, 18). In a fourth passage, the word is probably the result of a scribal slip, a *daleth* having been written for a *resh* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> XXVII, 3 [Isa 33,3]). The occurrences of the word in 4Q401 16, 2 = 4Q402 9, 3, and in 4Q417 2 I, 3 can all be explained through the meaning “absence of noise or agitated motion”. The occurrence of the word in five passages from the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q405 19ABCD, 7; 4Q405 20-21-22 II, 7, 8, 12, 13) perhaps provides evidence that the word could also be construed as “whisper”, but the *Songs* contains such convoluted syntax and sense that it is difficult to use these texts to help define דממה; this is all the more true since most of them seem to be (in part at least) interpreting a biblical verse (1 Kgs 19,12) that includes דממה and whose interpretation itself is disputed. Nevertheless, these passages, like the others, can be construed in such a way as to infer the meaning “absence of noise or agitated motion” for דממה.

\*  
\* \*

The word דממה denotes “silence, quiet” in the Bible and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Although the word appears in association with words that indicate sound or speech in Job 4,16 and in 1Kgs 19,12, it is not necessary to suggest that it had alternative meanings like “mutter, whisper,” nor is it necessary to postulate that it derives from a root associated with sound production like *d-m-m* II (“to mourn, moan”). Words semantically similar to דממה are found in post-biblical Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac texts modifying words for speech and sound. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, the word דממה appears in contexts where it can only denote “silence, quiet”. This meaning makes sense of the word’s usage in all these texts, but also reflects how this word was understood in later Jewish tradition, especially in the Targums where דממה is translated with words that clearly denote the absence of sound or noise<sup>(41)</sup>. For all these reasons, it is better to define

<sup>(41)</sup> On the use of דממה in later rabbinic writings, see L.H. SCHIFFMAN, “*Merkavah* Speculation at Qumran: The 4Q*Serekh Shirot* ‘*Olat ha-Shabbat*’, *Mystics, Philosophers, and Politicians*. Essays in Jewish Intellectual History in Honor of Alexander Altmann (eds. J. REINHARZ – D. SWETSCHINSKI) (Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 5; Durham 1982) 36-37.

דממה as “silence, quiet” and to derive it from the root *d-m-m* I (“to be silent”).

Dept. of Near Eastern Studies  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104 – USA

E.D. REYMOND

#### SUMMARY

The definition of the Hebrew word דממה (found in Biblical as well as in Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew) has been debated for many years. Recent dictionaries and studies of the word have proposed defining it as “sighing” or “whisper” and deriving it from the root *d-m-m* II associated with mourning and/or moaning. This study considers how the word is used in the Bible, in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as how similar words are used in other post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic texts; it concludes that the word דממה is more likely to mean “silence, quiet” or the absence of loud sound and motion in both the Hebrew of the Bible and that of the Dead Sea Scrolls and should be derived from the root *d-m-m* I (“to be silent”).



# ANIMADVERSIONES

## The Function of הִיטֵב in Jonah 4 and Its Translation (\*)

In Jonah 4,4 Yahweh asks Jonah a question: הִיטֵב חָרָה לָךְ. This same question is repeated with the addition of a prepositional phrase in v. 9: הִיטֵב חָרָה לָךְ עַל: הִקְקִינוּ. While there is no answer to the first question, Jonah answers the second in the affirmative: הִיטֵב חָרָה לִי עַד מוֹת (v. 9) <sup>(1)</sup>. In the discussion that follows, I will focus on the expression הִיטֵב in v. 4 since its two other occurrences are in virtually the same environment.

The question in v. 4 consists of three words. The last two (חָרָה לָךְ) constitute a well-attested idiom in Biblical Hebrew, which can roughly be rendered as “you became angry” or “you are angry” <sup>(2)</sup>. הִיטֵב is the *hiphil* infinitive absolute of יָטַב prefixed by an interrogative particle הֲ. The root יָטַב in the *hiphil* is often used in the sense of “do good”.

The infinitive absolute has several uses, most often occurring with the finite verb of the same root <sup>(3)</sup>. The infinitive absolute form הִיטֵב is used in this way in Gen 32,13 and Jer 7,5. Yet in Jonah 4 it is used alone without the cognate finite verb. Therefore, theoretically the form could function as a noun, an adverb, or a verb <sup>(4)</sup>. Such an independent use of הִיטֵב occurs eleven times in the Hebrew Bible. Of the eight cases outside the book of Jonah, six (Deut 9,21; 13,15; 17,4; 19,18; 27,8; 2 Kgs 11,18) can be classified as adverbs and two (Isa 1,17 <sup>(5)</sup>; Jer 10,5) as substantives <sup>(6)</sup>. Notably, the form is never used as a predicate that substitutes a finite verb.

(\*) I would like to thank Prof. Theodore J. Lewis for his comments on an earlier version of this work. Yet I am solely responsible for its contents. — This work was supported by a special research grant from Seoul Women’s University (2009).

<sup>(1)</sup> Since there is no word corresponding to “yes” in Biblical Hebrew, the affirmative answer to a yes-or-no question is often expressed with the repetition of the first word(s) of the question. See GKC, §150n; P. JOUÓN, *Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique* (1923; 2d repr., Rome 1996) §161; E.L. GREENSTEIN, “The Syntax of Saying “Yes” in Biblical Hebrew”, *JNES* 19 (1989) 51-59.

<sup>(2)</sup> HALOT, 351; TDOT V, 171.

<sup>(3)</sup> For this function of the infinitive absolute, see Y. KIM, *The Function of the Tautological Infinitive in Classical Biblical Hebrew* (HSS 60; Winona Lake, IN 2009).

<sup>(4)</sup> B.K. WALTKE – M. O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN 1990) 591-597.

<sup>(5)</sup> Without any context, we could render the clause in Isa 1,17 as “Learn to do good” by analyzing הִיטֵב as a substantive, or “Learn well” by taking it as an adverb. The clause is preceded by four imperative clauses (Isa 1,16), in which Yahweh urges the people to remove evil deeds. Therefore, a command to learn “to do good” better fits the context, giving weight to the understanding of the infinitive absolute in question as a substantive rather than an adverb.

<sup>(6)</sup> In the LXX, הִיטֵב in Jer 10,5 is rendered as a substantivized adjective (ἀγαθόν), whereas in Isa 1,17 it is translated using a substantivized adjective and an infinitive (καλὸν ποιεῖν).

How one translates the infinitive absolute will dramatically affect the understanding of the surrounding narrative. In what follows, I will evaluate three common renderings to see which best accords with the available linguistic evidence.

### 1. Three options for translation

The first option is to take the infinitive as a subject noun as does the 1898 translation of R. Young: "Is doing good displeasing to thee?"<sup>(7)</sup> According to this analysis, Yahweh is asking if his benevolent act of sparing Nineveh disturbs the prophet. This interpretation fits the context perfectly. Here "doing good" refers to Yahweh's change of his original plan to destroy the city. Yet the same approach does not produce as good a sense in v. 9, where Young translates: "Is doing good displeasing to thee, because of the gourd?" Though this type of rendering tries to be "literal", it misses the meaning of the idiomatic use of *חרה לך*, which means "you are angry". The verb *חרה* is used impersonally or it can have a body part as a subject<sup>(8)</sup>. Yet it cannot have an infinitive as subject, as Young's rendering seems to assume. The logical subject of "be angry" is often expressed by the complement of the preposition *ל*.

The second option is to take the infinitive absolute as an adverb that specifies the degree of the verbal action<sup>(9)</sup>. This approach has already been adopted by the LXX, which renders our sentence as "εἰ σφόδρα λελύπησαι σύ (literally, 'if you are very aggrieved')". According to this wooden translation of the LXX, the *חַיֵּשׁ* of the MT corresponds to the Greek adverb *σφόδρα*, which means "very (much)", "extremely", or "greatly"<sup>(10)</sup>. Old Latin follows the LXX using the adverb *valde*, which means "intensely" or "very much". P. Joüon renders *חַיֵּשׁ* as a French adverb "bien". He translates the sentence as "Tu es bien en colère!"<sup>(11)</sup> His translation strategy is followed by H.W. Brekelmans: "It seems you are really angry"<sup>(12)</sup>. J. Sasson also adopts this line of analysis and gives a translation "Are you utterly dejected?"<sup>(13)</sup> In a similar vein, the New JPS translation renders the sentence as "Are you that deeply grieved?"

The third and last option is to take the expression as a predicate. This is

<sup>(7)</sup> R. YOUNG, *Young's Literal Translation of the Holy Bible* (1898; repr., Grand Rapids, MI 1977). The use of *חַיֵּשׁ* as a subject noun is attested in Jer 10,5: *אֵלֶּם הַיֵּשׁ אִין אִוְתָם* "Moreover, doing good is not with them".

<sup>(8)</sup> See HALOT, 351; TDOT V, 171. The basic meaning of *חרה* is "be/become hot" or "burn". Most often it is the nose that becomes hot or burns; however, bones could also burn (Job 30,30).

<sup>(9)</sup> According to JOÜON (*Grammaire*, §§102e, 123r), the use of the infinitive absolute as a pure adverb developed as an extension of its adverbial use, in which the infinitive expresses a circumstance in relation to the preceding finite verb.

<sup>(10)</sup> BAGD, 796; LSJ, 1741. For this and other ancient renderings of Jonah 4,4, see P.L. TRIBLE, "Studies in the Book of Jonah" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University 1963) 50.

<sup>(11)</sup> JOÜON (*Grammaire*, §161b) thinks that the interrogative in Jonah 4,4 has an exclamatory nuance. Whether the sentence functions as a question or an exclamation is another issue. The issue, however, could not have been raised if Joüon had not taken the infinitive absolute form as an adverb.

<sup>(12)</sup> Chr.H.W. BREKELMANS, "Some Translation Problems", *OTS* 15 (1970) 175-176.

<sup>(13)</sup> J.M. SASSON, *Jonah. A New Translation with Introduction, Commentary, and Interpretation* (AB 24B; New York 1990) 5.

followed by most modern translations. They use a verb with an adverb “do well” (King James Version); a verb with a noun “have good reason” (New American Standard Bible), “avoir raison” (Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible), “have any right” (New International Version); or a predicative adjective “be right” (New Jerusalem Bible; New King James Version; New Revised Standard Version).

In this category, we can include the use of adverbs retaining the meaning of the root יָשָׁר such as “justly” or “rightly”. This use is distinct from the use of degree adverbs in the second option. For example, “Are you rightly angry?” has almost identical meaning with “Are you right to be angry?” Yet it is significantly different in meaning from “Are you very angry?” While “rightly” expresses the speaker’s judgment about the proposition<sup>(14)</sup>, “very” modifies the degree of the predicate. Some Greek versions support such an approach. For example, Symmachus has δὲκαίως, which means “rightly” or “justly”, and Aquila and Theodotion render it as καλῶς, which means “appropriately” or “rightly”<sup>(15)</sup>. A German version, Revidierte Lutherbibel, has “mit Recht”.

According to this third interpretation, Yahweh questions the appropriateness of the prophet’s anger upon his sparing the pagan city Nineveh. Since the translations are not strictly literal, it is not easy to pinpoint how the translators understood הַיָּשָׁר. It is possible that they divided the sentence into a noun and a noun clause, according to which the noun clause (חַרָּה לְךָ) functions as a subject and the noun (הַיָּשָׁר) as a predicate<sup>(16)</sup>. If this is the case, הַיָּשָׁר can be taken as a predicate noun. It is also possible that such translators understood the word as a predicate verb. The use of the infinitive absolute as a substitute for a finite verb is well known in the Hebrew Bible, especially in the later books, though הַיָּשָׁר is not found in this use<sup>(17)</sup>.

In sum, most modern translations render הַיָּשָׁר here as a predicate noun or a predicate verb. However, a few modern translations and Greek versions prefer to analyze הַיָּשָׁר as an adverb that modifies the verb.

## 2. The choice between an adverb and a predicate

The above discussion leaves us with two major ways in which to translate הַיָּשָׁר in Jonah 4, as a degree adverb or as a predicate. One’s choice reveals how translators (ancient and modern) understand the function of the Hebrew expression in question. More importantly, it also affects our understanding of the meaning of the passage.

If one uses an adverb and understands the sentence as “Are you very

<sup>(14)</sup> These adverbs do not modify the lexical meaning of the verb but the proposition as a whole. In our case, for example, they do not describe the manner in which Jonah became angry, but express a certain judgment of the speaker on the fact that Jonah is angry.

<sup>(15)</sup> BAGD, 198, 401; LSJ, 429, 870.

<sup>(16)</sup> This two-part division is supported by the Masoretic punctuation reflected in *BHS*.

<sup>(17)</sup> According to E. QIMRON, “Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 BCE – 200 CE) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents”, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (eds. D. DIMANT – U. RAPPAPORT) (STDJ 10; Leiden 1992) 358-359, “the use of the infinitive absolute as a predicate continuing a finite verb is typical of late BH and rare in classical BH”.

angry?" the utterance could be an expression of Yahweh's sympathy and understanding of Jonah's situation<sup>(18)</sup>. According to the story, Jonah, the reluctant prophet, is angry because his prophecy about the doom of Nineveh has not come true after he carried out Yahweh's instruction. In contrast, if one takes the infinitive absolute form as a predicate and translates the sentence as "Is it right that you are angry?" or "Are you rightly angry?", the question serves as an expression of Yahweh's displeasure at Jonah's unjustifiable anger. Most modern commentators choose the latter option<sup>(19)</sup>. However, contextually either option is possible.

The verb *חרה* is often modified by the adverb *מאד*<sup>(20)</sup>. When the latter follows the verb, it emphasizes the extent of the burning anger. Interestingly in Jonah 4,9, when Jonah answers Yahweh's question, he adds the prepositional phrase *עד מות* "to death" to his answer: Jonah is angry to death. This prepositional phrase is equivalent to a degree adverb. Thus, it is possible that the three occurrences of *היטב* in Jonah 4 also function as degree adverbs. But this alone cannot be conclusive evidence.

There are a few infinitive absolutes that have almost lost their functions as infinitives and behave as normal adverbs. Most of them are in the *hiphil*. Included in this category are *הרבה*, *השכם*, *הערב*, *הרחק*, *מהר*, and *היטב*<sup>(21)</sup>. The most common among these is *הרבה*. In almost all cases it simply means "much" and is often modified by another adverb *מאד*. The *hiphil* of the root *סכב* generally means "rise up early". However, its infinitive absolute form *השכם* simply means "early in the morning", "early", or "earnestly". In 1 Sam 17,16, *השכם* is coordinated with *הערב*, a denominative from the noun *ערב* "evening": "The Philistine drew near morning and evening (*השכם והערב*) and took his stand for forty days". The adverb *הרחק*, which occurs only four times, means "far away". As for *מהר*, the only *piel* form in our list, it almost always functions as an adverb that means "quickly" and modifies the preceding verb. According to Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, the adverb *היטב* expresses "the careful and thorough performance of an action"<sup>(22)</sup>. As an example, consider Deut 9,21 where *היטב* functions as a pure adverb.

ואכת אותו טחון היטב עד אשר דק לעפר

"I crushed it, grinding thoroughly until it became as fine as dust".  
(Deut 9,21)

<sup>(18)</sup> SASSON, *Jonah*, 287. It is notable, however, that though U. SIMON, *Jonah* (The JPS Bible Commentary; Philadelphia, PA 1999) 38-39, adopts the rendering of the new JPS translation of Jonah 4,4 "Are you that deeply angry?", he still thinks that Yahweh rejects the justification of Jonah's suffering and expects his prophet's repentance. Yet in this rendering, Yahweh does not ask, at least explicitly, if Jonah's anger is justifiable or not.

<sup>(19)</sup> See, e.g., L.C. ALLEN, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1976) 230-231; D.K. STUART, *Hosea-Jonah* (WBC 31; Nashville, TN 1987) 503-504; T.D. ALEXANDER, "Jonah: An Introduction and Commentary," *Obadiah, Jonah, Micah* (eds. D.W. BAKER – T.D. ALEXANDER – B.K. WALTKE) (TOTC; Leicester 1988) 127; SIMON, *Jonah*, 38-39.

<sup>(20)</sup> Gen 4,5; 34,7; Num 11,10; 16,15; 1 Sam 11,6; 18,8; 2 Sam 3,8; 12,5; 13,21; 2 Chr 25,10; Neh 4,1; 5,6.

<sup>(21)</sup> See GKC, §113k; JOÜON, *Grammaire*, §102e; WALTKE – O'CONNOR, *Introduction*, 592-593. In this list, all are in the *hiphil* except for *מהר*, which is in the *piel*.

<sup>(22)</sup> GKC, §113k.

Here הַיָּטֵב modifies another infinitive absolute שָׁחַן, which in turn modifies the finite verb וַאֲכַחֵם. The infinitive absolute שָׁחַן still maintains its verbal meaning “grind”. Therefore, הַיָּטֵב clearly functions as a conventional adverb here, while שָׁחַן is an infinitive absolute with an adverbial function that retains verbal characteristics.

Outside of the book of Jonah the conventional adverb הַיָּטֵב means “very” or “thoroughly”. Since it does not retain its original lexical meaning of “be good, just, or right”, it cannot be analyzed as a predicate. The three cases in Jonah are only syntactically different from others in that they are placed in the initial position of clause. This is probably due to the fact that they are the focus of the question or the answer<sup>(23)</sup>. In addition, if הַיָּטֵב is understood as a predicate, the subject would be the verb phrase (הָרַח לֵךְ). Yet the infinitive absolute does not occur as a predicate of the subject in the form of a verb phrase. Therefore, the rendering of הַיָּטֵב as a degree adverb best reflects its structure and function in Biblical Hebrew.

The word הַיָּטֵב can be interpreted in different ways to fit in the meaning of the context. Yet linguistic considerations based on the evidence from the Hebrew Bible suggest that we can better understand the function of הַיָּטֵב as a degree adverb rather than a type of predicate. According to this interpretation, Yahweh is not indifferent to Jonah’s emotions ruthlessly imposing his own agenda on his servant. On the contrary, Yahweh understands Jonah’s feelings and cares about his distress. As noted by J. Sasson, here Yahweh “sympathizes with Jonah’s despair”<sup>(24)</sup>.

Department of Christian Studies  
Seoul Women’s University  
Seoul 139-774, Republic of Korea

Yoo-ki KIM

### SUMMARY

Most modern translations render הַיָּטֵב in Jonah 4,4 as a predicate. However, traditional grammars take its function as an adverb that modifies the meaning of the verb, suggesting its translation as a degree adverb. Linguistic considerations support the latter option. This line of understanding opens up a possibility to interpret Yahweh’s question in Jonah 4,4 not as a confrontation but as an expression of consolation and compassion toward his prophet.

<sup>(23)</sup> In Biblical Hebrew, it is generally acknowledged that the unmarked constituent order of a clause is VSO (Verb-Subject-Object), and that the preverbal position is optionally reserved for special pragmatic functions such as topic or focus.

<sup>(24)</sup> SASSON, *Jonah*, 287.

## What Sort of Friends? A New Proposal Regarding רפאים (ם) and מפלי (ם) in Job 13,4 (\*)

ואולם אתם מפלי־שקר  
רפאי אלל כלכם

In Job 13,4, most translations have Job calling his companions something like “smearers of a lie” and “worthless physicians”. Upon closer inspection, both of those translations appear to be incorrect, and his reproaches are certainly more difficult to understand than many commentators would have the reader believe. To his credit, David J.A. Clines calls attention to the problem: “What exactly is Job’s criticism of the friends? The imagery of the verse is not clear”<sup>(1)</sup>.

### 1. Doctors or Rephaim?

To begin with the second charge of the indictment, רפאי אלל rewards closer scrutiny. Modern commentaries<sup>(2)</sup> overwhelmingly accept the reading of the MT (רפאי) and LXX (ιατροὶ κακῶν)<sup>(3)</sup>. Most recent translations go the same route, including the NRSV, NIV (both: “worthless physicians”), and NJPS (“quacks”). But this seems to be an uncritical acceptance; neither Job commentators nor the participants in the recent discussion about Rephaim in the Hebrew Bible have given this verse much philological attention at all. I contend that רפאים here is either an emendation or a misunderstanding of רפאים (Rephaim), referring to the spirits of the dead who are known to have been consulted for knowledge in other biblical texts, as the dead commonly were in the ancient Near East<sup>(4)</sup>. The verse’s context is full of references to death and

(\*) I would like to thank Carol Newsom, David Petersen, Joel LeMon, and Matthew Schlimm for reading and commenting on this article. Any remaining errors are entirely my own.

<sup>(1)</sup> D.J.A. CLINES, *Job 1–20* (Waco, TX 1989) 306.

<sup>(2)</sup> A representative sampling of commentaries that assume the translation “doctors” includes: S.R. DRIVER – G.B. GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (Edinburgh 1921) 121; S. TERRIEN, *Job* (Neuchâtel 1963) 114; G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Hiob* (Gütersloh 1963) 168; M.H. POPE, *Job* (Garden City, NY 1965) 94; F. HESSE, *Hiob* (Zürich 1978) 98; A. de WILDE, *Das Buch Hiob* (Leiden 1981) 238, 247; N.C. HABEL, *The Book of Job. A Commentary* (Philadelphia, PA 1985) 223; J.G. JANZEN, *Job* (Atlanta, GA 1985) 106; J.E. HARTLEY, *The Book of Job* (Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 219; R.L. ALDEN, *Job* (Nashville, TN 1993) 156–157; C. NEWSOM, “Job”, *The New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville, TN 1996) IV, 433; N. WHYBRAY, *Job* (Sheffield 1998) 74; S.E. BALENTINE, *Job* (Macon, GA 2006) 208–209.

<sup>(3)</sup> The LXX’s translation of the whole phrase is quite loose: “ιατροὶ ἄδικοι καὶ ιατροὶ κακῶν”. Some doubt is cast on the LXX’s understanding here by the fact that ιατροί is also used to translate רפאים in Isa 26,14 and Ps 88,11 (LXX 87,11), where the Rephaim are clearly meant (see below). The Vulgate, in an obvious exegetical move, alters the phrase to *cultores perversorum dogmatum*, “cultivators of perverse doctrines”.

<sup>(4)</sup> In the Hebrew Bible, when the dead are invoked for necromantic purposes, they go by specialized terminology such as אַשִׁימִים (Isa 19,3) and אַיִתּוֹת (Lev 19,31, etc.). The term רפאים is typically employed in instances of polemic against the power of the dead (cf. Ps 88,11.13), as here. The *locus classicus* for Israelite necromancy is, of course, Saul’s

divination (see below), two spheres in which the Rephaim are very much at home. Furthermore, the terms רפאים and אלל fit this interpretation better than the more common interpretation.

If the phrase רפאי אלל is understood to mean “worthless physicians”, then the construction is taken to be an attributive (epexegetical) genitive, where אלל modifies רפאי. Perhaps the best support for this interpretation comes from Jer 8,22, where a doctor is associated with a balsam balm (צר), which presumably would have been rubbed onto an afflicted area of the skin. In Job 13,4, then, that image of healing would be turned on its head when Job calls his friends “you who smear with lies” (מפלי שקר). Did Job need a doctor? There are, again, just enough suggestions in the book up to that point to justify that conclusion (e.g. 7,5: “My flesh is clothed with worms and dirt; my skin hardens, then breaks out again”; 9,17: “For he crushes me with a tempest, and multiplies my wounds without cause”). However, (1) such statements are relatively formulaic complaints in ancient Near Eastern laments; (2) they are not in the immediate context of 13,4; and (3) as I will demonstrate, “smearers” is not the most likely translation of מפלי in this verse. In sum, this line of interpretation has survived because it is not without some warrant; but it is not the best one available<sup>(5)</sup>.

A look at the immediate context of Job 13,4 suggests a new interpretation. The opening of the chapter revolves around the theme of knowledge: Job has seen, heard and understood (13,1); and what the friends know, he too knows (v. 2). Job wants to speak with the Almighty (v. 3), and v. 4 introduces a contrast (marked by אולם) between that face-to-face encounter and the corrupting mediation of knowledge by the friends.

The chapter break at ch. 13 probably introduces a false interruption of Job’s thought. Knowledge and understanding are also the subject of 12,24-25, in which Yahweh is said to deprive leaders of reason so that they wander lost (v. 24), grope in darkness, and stumble like drunkards (v. 25). It is difficult to ignore here the loud echoes of Isaiah’s condemnations of leaders under the influence of necromancy in Isa 8,19-22; 19,3.13-14<sup>(6)</sup>. Those passages employ some of the same images, and some of the same terms, e.g., תעה, נשכר,

---

consultation of the deceased Samuel in 1 Sam 28. As for the broader ancient Near Eastern picture, the necromantic aspects of the Mesopotamian *kispu* ritual and the Egyptian Letters to the Dead and cults of dead pharaohs are well established. At Ugarit, the *rpum* were at least invoked at the funeral of a king to bless the ongoing dynasty (KTU 1.161). The status of necromancy in Ugarit (and Syria-Palestine in general) is less clear, but G. del OLMO LETE has recently argued strongly for it: *Canaanite Religion*. According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit (Winona Lake, IN 2004) 232-246.

(<sup>5</sup>) Another theory, less popular, connects רפא with Arabic and Ethiopic roots meaning “to stitch”, so that the friends are “stitching a patchwork of lies” (so NEB). This theory has been propounded by A. DILLMANN, *Kommentar zur Hiob* (Leipzig 1891) 113; taken up by H. EWALD, *Commentary on the Book of Job* (London 1882) 160; and also by CLINES, *Job* 1-20, 281, 306. While this interpretation of רפא might be thought to mirror the concreteness of the image of smearing in the parallel colon, it does not seem a likely linguistic argument, given the lack of early attestations of such a root in any northwest Semitic language.

(<sup>6</sup>) On the date and interpretation of Isa 19, see my “Damning Egypt / Damning Egypt: The Paronomasia of *skr* and the Unity of Isa 19:1-15”, ZAW 120 (2008) 612-616.

השכ(ה). In all those instances, the dead are said to mislead, just as the friends speak falsely and deceitfully (Job 13,7)(<sup>7</sup>).

The funeral atmosphere of the text is repeatedly emphasized. Job began his speech in 12,2 by saying to his friends: "Wisdom will die with you" (עמכם תמות חכמה), already introducing a comparison between the friends and the dead. Job goes on to say, "Your maxims are proverbs of ash (אפר), your defenses are defenses of clay (חמר)" — ash and clay, since they are found in the tomb, had a long history of association with the dead in the ancient Near East. Among biblical attestations of this theme, see, for אפר, Mal 3,21; Ps 102,10; for חמר, see Job 10,9; 30,19; Isa 10,6; 41,25(<sup>8</sup>). Job foresees that he will join the friends in death (13,15), that he "will be silent and die" (v. 19). The silence of the dead is a theme found in various places in the Bible(<sup>9</sup>), and the friends are advised to keep silent (vv. 5, 13) rather than speaking falsely (v. 6).

From a lexical standpoint, a troubling feature of the translation "worthless physicians" is that both terms in the phrase must be understood in comparatively rare senses. In fact, although רפא is common enough as a verb, nowhere in the Hebrew Bible other than Jer 8,22 does the title רפא unambiguously refer to a human healer in the medical sense(<sup>10</sup>). In instances where the G active participle of רפא is used of God, it points precisely to a supernatural power, like the Rephaim(<sup>11</sup>).

It is also not clear whether, in classical Hebrew, an adjectival sense of אל(י) as "worthless" (thus cognate with Akk. *ulālu*) can be separated from the more common (and usually plural) references to the אלילים as foreign gods and idols, or whether the former meaning is abstracted from the latter. Even among instances of אלל that HALOT classifies as adjectival, it is clearly associated with foreign gods in texts such as Jer 14,14; Ps 96,5; and 1 Chr 16,26. If אל(י) in Job 13,4 described human doctors, that would make it

(<sup>7</sup>) This sort of rhetorical move just one of a number that the Hebrew Bible uses against necromancy, which is elsewhere outlawed (Lev 19,31; 20,6,27; Deut 18,11) or portrayed as the refuge of scoundrels (1 Sam 28; 2 Kgs 21,6; 1 Chr 10,13-14). Clearly, necromancy was seen as a threat to Yahwism.

(<sup>8</sup>) See also the term עפר: Ps 22,16,30; 30,10; Job 17,16; Dan 12,2.

(<sup>9</sup>) E.g., Ps 94,17: "If YHWH had not been my help, my soul would soon have dwelled in silence"; Ps 115,17: "The dead do not praise YHWH, nor do any that go down into silence"; cf. Ps 6,6; 88,11; 115,17; Isa 38,18; 47,5; Jer 48,2.

(<sup>10</sup>) It appears to be primarily in the intertestamental period that רפא came to mean simply "doctor" (cf. Ben Sirach 10,10; 38,1). In 2 Chr 16,12, Morris Jastrow considered the idea "rather absurd" that Asa should have been censured for consulting doctors, and preferred to emend to ראים (seers) or רפאים. He pointed out that the רפאים are parallel with the מרים in Isa 26,14 and Ps 88,11, and that דרש is frequently used for consulting the dead (e.g. Deut 18,11; Isa 8,19). See M. JASTROW, "Rô'eh and hōzēh in the Old Testament", *JBL* 28 (1909) 49-50, n. 23. The emendation to רפאים was noted and proposed by W. Rudolph in BHS. In Gen 50,20, the רפאים are Egyptian embalmers. While a full discussion of their title is beyond the scope of this study, it is notable that they are associated with the dead in that text, and are not healers, *per se*.

(<sup>11</sup>) This is not the place to re-hash the extensive debate over the etymology of the biblical Hebrew רפאים and their nature, nor that of the Ugaritic *rpum*. Suffice it to say that their status as informants and protectors from the great beyond is much more clear than their function as "healers". See, for example, P.J. WILLIAMS, "Are the Biblical Rephaim and the Ugaritic *RPUM* Healers?", *The Old Testament in Its World* (Leiden 2005) 266-275.



nearly the only instance in biblical Hebrew in which it describes the worthlessness of something non-divine<sup>(12)</sup>.

If the אֱלִילִים are indeed divinities, would they be associated with the Rephaim? Indeed: אֱלִילִים is parallel with אַמִּים in Isa 19,3; there is a broad consensus that the latter term is cognate with Akk. *etimmu*, a term for a ghost<sup>(13)</sup>. In Isa 19, אֱלִילִים served as a term for the divinized dead who are consulted for knowledge<sup>(14)</sup>. Although אֱלִיל certainly came to be a general term for a false god or idol, it seems to have been specifically associated with ancestor worship in Leviticus as well<sup>(15)</sup>. Therefore it is more probable that אֱלִיל has something to do with divinized spirits of the dead than with “doctors”.

If אֱלִילִים and רַפְּאִים can indeed both refer to “spirits of the dead”, then how is one to understand the syntax of the phrase רַפְּאִי אֱלִיל? Instead of an attributive (epexegetical) genitive, it functions as a genitive of association, where the רַפְּאִים belong to the class of אֱלִיל (“false gods”)<sup>(16)</sup>. Thus, for the whole phrase, something like “false oracles” better captures the meaning.

Here the witness of the Targum to Job is of some interest, since it reads,  
וּבְרַם אֲתוֹן מַחְבְּרֵי שֶׁקֶר בְּמַסִּי אֱלִיל וּמוֹרְדָקָא דְּפִלְסִיָּה סְכִיָּה הַכְרִין כּוֹלָכִין

“And indeed you are associates of falsehood; like vain idols, and dead flesh that the knife opens up, thus are you all”<sup>(17)</sup>. I would deem this expansion a double translation of רַפְּאִי אֱלִיל that sought to capture both the senses I have argued for: the friends are portrayed as false oracles and as the dead.

## 2. Smearers or slanderers?

As for the first charge of the indictment, one should question the typical translation of שֶׁקֶר טַפְּלֵי as “smearers of falsehood”<sup>(18)</sup>. *HALOT* considers

<sup>(12)</sup> Zech 11,17 might be the only other instance, depending on the identity of the shepherd.

<sup>(13)</sup> See, for example, T.J. LEWIS, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM 39; Atlanta, GA 1989) 133-134 and further references in n. 16; CADE, 397-401.

<sup>(14)</sup> On necromancy in ancient Egypt, see R.K. RITNER, “Necromancy in Ancient Egypt”, *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World* (eds. L. CIRAOLO – J. SEIDEL) (Ancient Magic and Divination 2; Leiden 2002) 89-96.

<sup>(15)</sup> In Lev 26,1, the אֱלִילִים are condemned alongside the מַצֵּבָה, a stone structure which according to Albright’s classic theory was associated with ancestor- or hero-worship. More interesting still Lev 19,3-4, where the fear of mother and father (v. 3) is juxtaposed with the prohibition not to turn to אֱלִילִים (v. 4). It was proposed some time ago by Brichto that the Decalogue’s injunction to “honor thy father and mother” originally referred to ancestor worship; if so perhaps Lev 19,4 is a later revision (or clarification) of the law after ancestor worship was banned in Judah.

<sup>(16)</sup> See B.K. WALTKE – M. O’CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN 1990) 153.

<sup>(17)</sup> D.M. STEC, *The Text of the Targum of Job. An Introduction and Critical Edition* (Leiden 1994) 86\*; cf. C. MANGAN et al., *The Targum of Job* (Collegeville, MN 1991) 43. Job 13 is not preserved in the Targum to Job from Qumran (11QtgJob).

<sup>(18)</sup> Though wooden, this translation appears to reflect the underlying assumptions of such translations as the NIV’s “you ... smear me with lies” and the NRSV’s “you whitewash with lies”.

טפל “an alternate form of חפל”, i.e., חפל (II), “to whitewash”. However, there is a better option: חפל (I), “to utter stupidity, speak foolishly”. In fact, the irregular Akkadian cognate of the latter root would seem to be *ṭapālu*, “to scorn, slander, insult” (G/D; cf. also Š: “disseminate slanders, put to shame”<sup>(19)</sup>)—and this root seems *clearly* relevant to the understanding of טפל in Job 13,4. The Akk. verb *ṭapālu* could be used to describe the maligning of deities<sup>(20)</sup>, and it is found in the Amarna letters<sup>(21)</sup>, supporting the possibility of a West Semitic cognate. Friedrich Horst noted the phrase *amat tašgirti ṭapilti PN ana PN<sub>2</sub> idbubma* (“[Urša] made treacherous statements against PN to PN<sub>2</sub>”)<sup>(22)</sup> in the annals of Sargon II<sup>(23)</sup>. Oddly, however, Horst seems to have assumed that the Akkadian root had the same sense of “smearing” as the Hebrew root, which it does not.

Might not other biblical attestations of טפל be better translated “slander” or “insult” rather than “smear”? For example, Ps 119,69’s טפל על שקר ודמים would be better rendered, “The arrogant have wrongly uttered a lie against me”, instead of “smeared a lie upon me. This is not to claim that the roots טפל/ח, meaning “to smear, whitewash”, do not exist — they do — but rather that they seem to have coalesced and been confused with another set of roots טפל/ח, “to speak falsely, slander, insult”.

Connecting טפל to the aforementioned root brings 13,4 in line with the book’s broader concern about blasphemy. The nominal form טפלה is found in Job 1,22: לא נתן חפלה לאלהים, “[Job] did not give blasphemy to God”<sup>(24)</sup> (cf. also 42,7-8). The friends do, however, blaspheme. Job repeatedly asserts his innocence, and in 13,3-4 he contrasts the promise of true speech from God with the friends’ false speech. By framing the matter in this way, with this apparent intertextual reference, the author of Job intensifies the blame on the friends. Job asserts that he and God must both be in the right, but that corrupt intermediaries stand in the way of mutual understanding.

If all this is correct, then Job, instead of charging that the friends have failed to fulfill a medical role in healing him, is complaining that they have spoken falsely as sources of wisdom and would mislead their hearers — just as the spirits of the dead were so often said to have done<sup>(25)</sup>. By comparing his friends to the Rephaim, he condemns them as representatives of apostasy and heresy. The verse might thus be translated in this way: “You, however, are

<sup>(19)</sup> See CAD D, 47-48; also S. PARPOLA (ed.), *Assyrian-English-Assyrian Dictionary* (Helsinki 2007) 126.

<sup>(20)</sup> Ištar speaks of *allū 4GIŠ.GIN.MAŠ ša utappilanni* — “that Gilgamesh who has slandered me” (Epic of Gilgamesh, SBV, VI.155; ŠAAT 1, 93); cf. CAD D, 48; also S. DALLEY, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (Oxford 1989) 82.

<sup>(21)</sup> EA 1:91: “You humiliated them (*tuteppilšunu*) before the country where you are. Cf. W.L. MORAN, *The Amarna Letters* (Baltimore, MD 1992) 2, 5, n. 36.

<sup>(22)</sup> F. HORST, *Hiob* (BKAT 16/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968) 198.

<sup>(23)</sup> Cf. A.G. LIE, *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria* (Paris 1929) 102. Also CAD T, 286.

<sup>(24)</sup> I agree with HALOT, 734, against NRSV and NIV, which seem to think it is God who is in danger of wrongdoing.

<sup>(25)</sup> E.g., Isa 8,19; 19,3.

blatherers of lies, and false oracles, all of you. The translation “worthless physicians”, beloved throughout the history of interpretation, should now be relegated to history.

Near Eastern Studies  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
135 N. Oakland Ave.  
Pasadena, CA 91182, USA

Christopher HAYS

#### SUMMARY

Most translations of Job 13,4 have Job calling his companions something like “smearers of a lie” and “worthless physicians”. Instead, in light of philological and comparative data, he seems to be comparing his friends to the Rephaim, and false gods. In this way, he complains that they have spoken falsely as sources of wisdom and would mislead their hearers — just as the spirits of the dead were so often said to have done. The verse might thus be translated in this way: “You, however, are blatherers of lies, and false oracles, all of you.

## **Burn or Boast?**

### **Keeping the 1 Corinthians 13,3 Debate in Balance**

The textual variant of 1 Corinthians 13,3 has become infamous and continues to attract debate. Did Paul speak of giving over his body in order that he might “boast” or that he might “be burned”?

This short note need not recapitulate the ever-increasing volume of literature on the subject. Rather, it is presented as a supplement to the recent and detailed survey by Claude Perera, whose study already catalogues the vast majority of relevant contributions<sup>(1)</sup>. We are thus able to progress the discussion several years by confirming, correcting and complementing Perera’s work. What we find is twofold. Perera has underestimated how much the dyke of tradition has crumbled over recent decades; a flood of interpreters is abandoning “burn” for “boast”. Yet consensus is not complete. Indeed the tide may be starting to turn back, with a number of recent studies defending the plausibility of “burn”. One important factor in the debate is the grammatical viability of one of the variants; interpreters are often swayed by the perceived admissibility or illegitimacy of a future subjunctive. This short note offers a review of some recent representative literature, and draws attention to ongoing discoveries concerning the viability of a future subjunctive.

#### *1. The Increasing Flood*

Although at least eight variants are attested in the MSS<sup>(2)</sup>, scholars regularly reduce the primary choice to two or three. It is recognized that the likely pathway between these variants involved the alteration of only one letter at a time:

- a. καυχῆσμαι, aorist subjunctive middle of καυχάομαι, “boast”
- b. καυθήσμαι, future subjunctive passive of καίω, “burn”
- c. καυθήσομαι, future indicative passive of καίω, “burn”<sup>(3)</sup>. Of course, the order in which these changes took place is the precise question at stake: was “burn” altered to “boast”, or “boast” transmuted into “burn”? And if some form of καίω was original, which?

<sup>(1)</sup> C. PERERA, “Burn or Boast? A Text Critical Analysis of 1 Cor 13:3”, *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 18 (2005) 111-128, esp. 113, n. 5.

<sup>(2)</sup> See especially C.C. CARAGOUNIS, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament* (WUNT 167; Tübingen 2004) 549-550. Some further spelling variations are catalogued by R.J. SWANSON (ed.), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*. 1 Corinthians (Wheaton, IL 2003) 203.

<sup>(3)</sup> The other variants, bar one (itself occurring but once), are further forms of the verb καίω, typically indicative passive ones. Although these are not viable contenders for the original reading, Caragounis demonstrates whence they might be derived (and how they support his thesis).

The external evidence primarily attests the first two of these. The first is found in MSS of the Alexandrian tradition, while the second largely enjoys Western and Byzantine evidence including “a majority of patristic writers”<sup>(4)</sup>. The third is included here in anticipation of later discussion and is, itself, considered original by a number of interpreters.

Regardless of preference, scholars recognize that such attestation gives the first option, “boast”, an apparent advantage. This has undoubtedly contributed to its rise in favour over the last two or three decades. Near the start of this new trend, in what has proved to be one of the seminal articles, Jacobus Petzer could complain that “καυχῆσθαι seems to be the least popular” of the major contenders<sup>(5)</sup>. Even quite recently Perera reluctantly concludes that “It is only a few scholars who favour the reading καυχῆσθαι”<sup>(6)</sup>. However, we need to notice that the number of translations and commentators abandoning “burn” for “boast” is much greater than Perera allows. The data for this increasing flood can be catalogued in several ways.

First, the momentum in favour of “boast” continues to increase. Perhaps because it remains the preferred reading of NA<sup>26.27</sup> and UBSGNT<sup>3.4</sup>, English translations continue to adopt it. Perera found the RSV (1971) and NRSV (1989) to be “Unique exceptions among modern versions”<sup>(7)</sup>. Yet three more should be named here. The NLT (1996, 2004) is a scholarly paraphrase designed to update and replace the popular Living Bible. The NET Bible (2005) is popular with internet publishers, and increasingly among print authors. And the TNIV (2001, 2005) is intended to supersede the immensely influential NIV. The first and last of these are indeed being widely adopted, and are poised to move the debate from the academy into the church, and may continue to influence the trend in vernacular translations around the globe<sup>(8)</sup>.

Second, this trend is fuelled as much by commentaries as by translations. To Perera’s survey we must add several more: some which he had not listed, and others published more recently<sup>(9)</sup>. Support is also found, in passing, in an array of other studies which touch on this verse<sup>(10)</sup>.

<sup>(4)</sup> D.E. GARLAND, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT 7; Grand Rapids, MI 2003) 627.

<sup>(5)</sup> J.H. PETZER, “Contextual Evidence in Favor of ΚΑΥΧΕΣΘΑΙ in 1 Corinthians 13.3”, *NTS* 35 (1989) 230.

<sup>(6)</sup> PERERA, “Burn or Boast?”, 119.

<sup>(7)</sup> PERERA, “Burn or Boast?”, 112.

<sup>(8)</sup> I emulate Perera’s heavy emphasis on English versions. But a shift towards “boast” can also be found in foreign translations, such as the International Bible Society’s BDS (1999): “au point de pouvoir m’en vanter”.

<sup>(9)</sup> E.g. W.F. ORR – J.A. WALTHER, *1 Corinthians* (AB 32; Garden City, NY 1976) 291; B. WITHERINGTON III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth* (Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 268; R.B. HAYS, *First Corinthians* (IBC; Louisville, KY 1997) 225; R.A. HORSLEY, *1 Corinthians* (ANTC; Nashville, TN 1998) 176; A.C. THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2000) 1042-1044; G.J. LOCKWOOD, *1 Corinthians* (Concordia Commentary; St Louis, MI 2000) 457-458; N.T. WRIGHT, *Paul for Everyone. 1 Corinthians* (London 2003) 173-174; J.A. FITZMYER, *First Corinthians* (AYB 32; New Haven, CT 2008) 494; B.S. ROSNER – R.E. CIAMPA, *1 Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids, MI forthcoming). Perera does cite some of these on other matters (notably the scholarly volumes of Orr – Walther, and Thiselton) but fails to adduce their support for “boast”.

<sup>(10)</sup> E.g. M.M. MITCHELL, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY 1992) 91; J.F.M. SMIT, “Two Puzzles: 1 Corinthians 12.31 and 13.1: A Rhetorical Solution”, *NTS* 39 (1993) 255-258; M.D. GOULDER, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth* (Peabody,

Third, there is even wider support for “boast” amongst the translations and commentaries that Perera himself identifies. He is wrong in claiming a mere “handful” of supporters, because he has misclassified several works. In particular, the landmark commentary by Gordon Fee actually promotes Perera’s preferred variant<sup>(11)</sup>. Similarly, Perera has cited only the earlier edition of the NAB (1970); its revised NT (1986) — apparently influenced by the updating of UBSGNT<sup>3</sup> (1975), NA<sup>26</sup> (1979) and the Nova Vulgata (1979) — now also prefers “boast”.

Thus we need to move beyond the impression that there is only pitiful support for this *lectio difficilior*. The tide had already turned noticeably in favour of “boast” before the beginning of this century (pace Perera), and continues to be the preferred choice of commentators and translators alike. The early lament of Petzer must now be replaced by the more recent one of David Garland, that “boast” is now the preference of “many recent commentators”<sup>(12)</sup>.

However, there are those who continue to defend the more traditional “burn”<sup>(13)</sup>. Proponents of either verb concede that the final decision turns on matters of intrinsic probability based on internal issues as much as on the external manuscript evidence<sup>(14)</sup>.

## 2. The Pivotal Question of the Future Subjunctive

We are not rehearsing here every internal argument. However, we must recognize that most accept or reject the second variant based on their understanding of its grammatical viability.

Influential publications insist that καυθήσωμαι should be rejected on such grounds. Fee’s NICNT volume labels it “a grammatical monstrosity

---

MA 2001) 253; J. CORLEY, “The Pauline Authorship of 1 Corinthians 13”, *CBQ* 66 (2004) 259; J.E. AGUILAR CHUI, *1 Cor 12–14*. Literary Structure and Theology (AnBib 166; Rome 2007) 291–292.

<sup>(11)</sup> So G.D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 629, n. 18, 633–635; C.L. BLOMBERG, *1 Corinthians* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 259; cf. BLOMBERG, *From Pentecost to Patmos* (Nottingham 2006) 191, n. 96. Perera has misclassified these as supporters of “burn” because the commentaries initially print the text of the NIV — though the commentators later move to distance themselves from the NIV’s choice of variant. Similarly, Perera judges A.F. JOHNSON, *1 Corinthians* (IVPNTC 7; Downers Grove, IL 2004) in favour of “burn”, even though Johnson is ultimately ambivalent about the NIV’s choice (pp. 245–246). The error also works the other way; Perera counts the support of C.S. KEENER, *1–2 Corinthians* (NCBC; Cambridge 2005) 108–109, but Keener distances himself from the NRSV text printed in his commentary series.

<sup>(12)</sup> GARLAND, *1 Corinthians*, 627.

<sup>(13)</sup> E.g. C. FOCANT, “1 Corinthiens 13. Analyse rhétorique et analyse de structures”, *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. BIERINGER) (BETL 125; Leuven 1996) 222, n. 274; W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (1Kor 11,17–14,40) (EKKNT 7/3; Zürich 1999) 290–291; A. LINDEMANN, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9/1; Tübingen 2000) 285–286; GARLAND, *1 Corinthians*, 627–628; E. WAALER, *The Shema and The First Commandment in First Corinthians* (WUNT 2/253; Tübingen 2008) 311. Some form of the “burn” reading is also retained in the recent ESV (2001) and HCSB (2000, 2003) translations, as well as other vernacular versions.

<sup>(14)</sup> E.g. FEE, *First Corinthians*, 629, n. 18; PETZER, “In Favor of KAYXHΩΜΑΙ”, 231; FOCANT, “1 Corinthiens 13”, 222, n. 274; GARLAND, *1 Corinthians*, 627; CARAGOUNIS, *Development of Greek*, 563.

(future subjunctive; otherwise unknown in the *koineē* period, but occurring in the Byzantine)"<sup>(15)</sup>. The dramatic claim is echoed in Bruce Metzger's TCGNT explanations, in turn promulgated by Daniel Wallace's exegetical grammar<sup>(16)</sup>. The charge of "grammatical monstrosity" continues to be readily found beyond the confines of North America<sup>(17)</sup>.

This sentiment is then used to explain the variants and their order of development. If the list above correctly anticipates the progress of the amendments, then the shift from *καυχῆσμαι* to *καυθήσμαι* was insufficient; subsequent scribes could not accept the future subjunctive as a valid form of the verb *καίω*, so they then (further) emended it to *καυθήσομαι*. Branding the future subjunctive inadmissible also explains the reverse trajectory: if the original was *καυθήσομαι*, somehow altered to *καυθήσμαι*, discomfort with the future subjunctive likely gave rise to an alternate amendment, *καυχῆσμαι*.

These hypothetical trajectories leave a number of unanswered questions which, in turn, typify the issues at stake:

- a. If the original was *καυθήσομαι*, why would a scribe emend it to the rarer (even illegitimate) future subjunctive (*καυθήσμαι*)?
- b. A likely answer, relevant to the debate, is that some scribes may have been uncomfortable with the future indicative in a *ἵνα* clause, even though the latter construction is found in Scripture.
- c. The same question must be asked of the other trajectory. If *καυχῆσμαι* was the original, why emend this common aorist subjunctive to the rarer/illegitimate future subjunctive?
- d. Although not generally promoted by scholars, could *καυθήσμαι* be the original reading? If so, we could readily understand its emendation either to a more Pauline verb (*καίω* is otherwise unused by the apostle) or to a more grammatically acceptable form.
- e. Yet, whether the first or middle step in a series of corrections, this demonstrates the complexities of trying to second-guess scribal sensibilities. In any of the trajectories we are attempting to determine whether a scribe was less uncomfortable with a future subjunctive (*καυθήσμαι*) or a *ἵνα* clause with an indicative (*καυθήσομαι*).
- f. All of these suggestions still intimate a general aversion to the future subjunctive, positing reasons for emendation away from *καυθήσμαι*. Yet why does this reading boast the widest array of external attestation? Why, for those who defend a sense of "burn" in 1 Cor 13,3, is this often the form from which they develop their argument?

The validity of the future subjunctive becomes crucial in our determination of the text and its development. Not only is it important to

<sup>(15)</sup> FEE, *First Corinthians*, 629, n. 18.

<sup>(16)</sup> B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London 1971) 564, and (Stuttgart 1994) 498; D.B. WALLACE, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 463, n. 441.

<sup>(17)</sup> E.g. FOCANT, "1 Corinthiens 13", 222, n. 274: "une monstruosité grammaticale"; LINDEMANN, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 285: "ein Barbarismus" (citing Heinrich's nineteenth-century commentary).

evaluate the admissibility or inadmissibility of the future subjunctive but, if we do permit it, it is also incumbent upon textual critics to consider the extent to which a scribe might have embraced or avoided such in preference to other constructions. All things considered, it seems that there is something plausible about the future subjunctive, despite the dramatic claims against it and the subsequent movement towards “boast”.

### 3. *Fresh Contributions on the Future Subjunctive*

On this point, New Testament scholars have found the work of Chrys Caragounis to be persuasive<sup>(18)</sup>. It is important to recognize that his original 1995 *SEA* article has been revised, although it may be overlooked in its unannounced position in the closing stages of a thicker and more technical monograph<sup>(19)</sup>.

Of similar significance is the research of Nick Nicholas, an analyst with the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* project<sup>(20)</sup>. It should be drawn to New Testament scholars’ attention for several reasons. First, it is even more recent and detailed than Caragounis’s study. Second, the titles of both article and journal (which emphasize Byzantine use) belie its relevance to the question at hand and it may not otherwise be investigated. Third, while Nicholas has worked independently of Caragounis and emphasizes a substantially different corpus, his conclusions closely and effectively corroborate the arguments Caragounis has developed. A précis here is appropriate for those without access to *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* or the opportunity to examine leisurely all 40 pages of Nicholas’s detailed analysis.

Nicholas explores the idea that, semantically, the aorist subjunctive (and present subjunctive) already expressed a future sense, explaining why Classical Greek had never previously developed a formal future subjunctive. He also adds some morphological factors justifying this lacuna. Like Caragounis, Nicholas confirms the progressive displacement of the future indicative by the aorist subjunctive. Where Caragounis relies principally upon the insights of Jannaris’s grammar (1897), Nicholas adds support from many other nineteenth- and twentieth-century grammarians, along with the second-century observations of Apollonius Dyscolus. Both Caragounis and Nicholas (along with other works like BDF) are alert to the contribution and potential confusion of phonological similarities, as per the ομα/ωμα endings at stake in 1 Cor 13.3.

These observations obviously remain important for the passage at hand. Nicholas confirms that “the existence of a future subjunctive is not the absurdity some commentators have claimed”<sup>(21)</sup>. His concern is with the semantic and morphological factors that shaped its evolution prior to its prevalence in Byzantine times. Consequently, he affirms the same

<sup>(18)</sup> E.g. R.F. COLLINS, *First Corinthians* (SP 7; Collegeville, PA 1999) 476-477; GARLAND, *1 Corinthians*, 628.

<sup>(19)</sup> CARAGOUNIS, *Development of Greek*, 547-564. Note also a 2006 corrected reprint.

<sup>(20)</sup> N. NICHOLAS, “The Passive Future Subjunctive in Byzantine Texts”, *ByzZ* 101 (2008) 89-131.

<sup>(21)</sup> NICHOLAS, “Passive Future Subjunctive”, 94.



phenomenon as Caragounis and others: that scribes started to “hypercorrect” various forms during this transition period. “So there was a countervailing tendency to insert future indicatives into subordinate clauses even if they did not belong — and then (quite possibly as a hypercorrection) to smooth the insertion over by making the futures look subjunctive, if at all possible”<sup>(22)</sup>. With respect to 1 Cor 13,3, this gives further legitimacy both to καθήσεται (as a future indicative in a purposive ἵνα clause) and to καθήσεται (as an increasingly common “subjunctive” guise in such contexts).

Nicholas provides further study of the development of the future subjunctive as a distinguishable tense. He provides a lengthy collation and discussion of unambiguous future subjunctive passive forms in biblical and extra-biblical use<sup>(23)</sup>. While he confirms here that “we have no secure record of the tense before the fourth century Church Fathers”, he briefly explores other biblical examples where scribes have faced similar grammatical confusions (e.g. 1 Tim 6,8; Heb 2,3; 1 Pet 3,1; Matt 26,33; Ps 82,2 LXX [Eng. 83,1]; Prov 9,11 LXX; some noted by BDF §28, but unmarked in UBSGNT<sup>4</sup> and NA<sup>27</sup>).

This does not, of course, resolve the question of the variant. Caragounis is adamant that καθήσεται (and others) evolved from an original καθήσεται<sup>(24)</sup>. Nicholas interprets the linguistic data in a similar direction, but without seeking a solution. Indeed, he demonstrates that the opposite semantic result can also be confirmed textually: Origen obviously wrote about “boast” in his early-third-century commentary, but Byzantine scribes conformed his language to “burn”<sup>(25)</sup>.

\*  
\* \*

Students of 1 Cor 13,3 must thus remain aware of two distinct and opposing “currents” in the tide of debate. Each appears to be increasing in intensity despite — and perhaps because of — the voracity of the other<sup>(26)</sup>.

We would thus recognize that Perera’s catalogue of those who support “boast” is much weaker than it should be. A great many scholars continue to migrate towards this reading. Those who rely upon these findings will no doubt continue to be swept up, adding momentum to the accelerating trend away from the traditional “burn”.

Yet, at the very same instance, the ongoing research of Caragounis and Nicholas demonstrates a scribal transition towards a distinguishable,

<sup>(22)</sup> NICHOLAS, “Passive Future Subjunctive”, 98.

<sup>(23)</sup> NICHOLAS, “Passive Future Subjunctive”, 109-117.

<sup>(24)</sup> E.g. CARAGOUNIS, *Development of Greek*, 563.

<sup>(25)</sup> NICHOLAS, “Passive Future Subjunctive”, 117. The same textual choice and explanation is offered by D.D. HANNAH, *The Text of 1 Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (SBLNTG 4; Atlanta, GA 1997) 250.

<sup>(26)</sup> The debate is so even that some modern commentaries either omit discussion altogether (which may not be inappropriate for their series) or do mention the variant but give even-handed explanation of either option; e.g. KEENER, *1-2 Corinthians*, 108-109; B.W. POWERS, *First Corinthians. An Exegetical and Explanatory Commentary* (Eugene, OR 2008) 338. We should also note THISELTON’s, *First Corinthians. A Shorter Exegetical and Pastoral Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI 2006) 220; the issue is sufficiently balanced that, while Thielton still clearly favours “boast”, he accidentally writes “burn”!

legitimate future subjunctive, particularly in main and purpose clauses. Indeed, that tense seems to have developed exclusively within religious writings, hinting that such biblical constructions were key catalysts in — if not actual examples of — its evolution. This may then grant support to those who favour the traditional “burn” variant(s).

Recognizing these two competing tides will be an important factor as scholars continue to determine which may prove dominant in the coming decades. At the very least it should bring a sense of balance to those, in either camp, who wish to declare any degree of consensus in the debate.

Ridley Melbourne  
Mission & Ministry College  
170 The Avenue, Parkville 3052, Australia

Andrew S. MALONE

#### SUMMARY

The textual variant of 1 Corinthians 13,3 continues to attract debate. Recent surveys argue that there is a modicum of interest in preferring “boast” over the traditional “burn”. This short note demonstrates that support for “boast” is far more widespread than may be realised. Yet, at the same time, a number of recent philological studies demonstrate that “burn” may not be as grammatically inadmissible as is sometimes claimed. The note suggests that the debate is far from won for either option.

## RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

### **“The Disputed Words of the Eucharistic Institution (Luke 22,19b-20): The Long and Short of the Matter”<sup>(1)</sup>**

#### I. The Problem and the Textual Evidence

The author of this quite fascinating book examines a variation-unit in the New Testament text that has been considered one of the most theologically significant textual problems in Luke-Acts: the two readings in the “Last Supper” account in Luke 22,17-20. Each of these variants mentions a cup to be divided among the disciples (vv. 17-18), while the “shorter” reading (lacking vv. 19b-20) reports only the breaking of bread and the saying, “This is my body” (19a). Codex Bezae and five Old Latin manuscripts (*a, d, ff<sup>e</sup>, i, l*) witness this “shorter” reading. The “longer” reading adds “which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me,” and includes a second cup and the saying, “This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood”. The rest of the textual tradition supports the longer variant.

Billings’s treatment consists of three parts, and his thesis might be summarized as follows: Using external or manuscript evidence, he favors the longer reading, and then turns to a broad range of internal evidence to determine whether the additional material in that reading is Lukan in style and in theology. Although some vocabulary and elements of style are non-Lukan, their sources can be found in Mark or in 1 Corinthians or its underlying tradition, and Billings affirms also that the longer reading is in no way alien to Lukan theology. He feels that the shorter reading’s origin must be explained if the priority of the longer reading is to be maintained. He rejects a scribal mistake or misunderstanding as causes for the shorter variant and seeks a sociological context that will explain how it could have arisen from the longer reading. His answer is that the latter was abbreviated under pressure during or after the persecution at Lyons in 177 CE to reduce the risk to Christians due to their ritual practices. That is, by removing implications of cannibalism and other unacceptable practices (eating human flesh and drinking blood, and the ritual-sounding vicarious phrases), threats from outside the Christian community might be neutralized. He asserts that this shortening of the longer text was performed on a parent manuscript of Codex Bezae, accounting for the shorter reading in that famous manuscript.

Part 1, “The Textual Problem”, has a brief introduction, delineating both the text-critical issues and the implications that any solution holds for liturgi-

<sup>(1)</sup> Bradley S. BILLINGS, *Do This in Remembrance of Me. The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution (Luke 22.19b–20). An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis* (Library of New Testament Studies 314; London – New York, T&T Clark, 2006, xviii-211 p. 16 x 24. £60.00).

cal practice among virtually all Christians past and present, thus setting the stage for both the technical aspects of the issue and its application to church practice. Chapter 1, "The Nature of the Problem", provides the textual evidence for the shorter reading and discusses that reading's designation, in Chapter 2, as a "Western Non-Interpolation". Chapter 3 describes the primary witness for the shorter variant, "The Codex Bezae (D 05)", utilizing evidence from and judgments by previous scholars. In particular, Billings references D.C. Parker's *Codex Bezae*<sup>(?)</sup>, the latest major work on that anomalous manuscript, to establish an important methodological point: Codex D, the leading witness for the so-called "Western" text type of Luke is not a single aberrant manuscript, but represents a textual tradition. That is, the text of D in many respects is older than the codex in which it is found (16-19). As to the provenance of Codex Bezae, Billings settles on Lyons rather quickly—too quickly, I think, since there is no mention of Parker's discussion and dismissal of nine theories (including Lyons) before defending Berytus/Beirut<sup>(?)</sup>. Reasons for this unilateral decision appear, by implication, in the volume's last chapter.

Part II, "Theories and Explanations", consists of Chapters 4–8 and occupies sixty-five percent of the volume. A three-page "Forward" succinctly lays out the text-critical options on the originality or non-originality of the two variant readings, again with a summary of the external and internal text-critical evidence for each, showing, deftly though very briefly, how each variant's originality plausibly could be supported by various internal arguments, laying the groundwork for the succeeding discussion. The following five chapters consider whether the disputed words (Luke 22,19b-20) are Lukan or non-Lukan in nature.

## II. Lukan or Non-Lukan Character of the Disputed Passage (vv. 19b-20)

### 1. *Non-Lukan Words*

Chapter 4, "The Non-Lukan Origins of the Disputed Words", is a meticulous assessment of ten words, phrases, and constructions that, according to Billings, plausibly are not in accord with Lukan style elsewhere or, if so, can be explained as having been taken from Luke's Markan source or from 1 Cor 11,23-26 or the tradition behind it (26-36). Billings then poses a dilemma. On text-critical principles, the shorter and generally harder reading might be preferred, and it could then account for the longer text as a scribal expansion, thus satisfactorily explaining the origin and chronological sequence of the two variant readings (35-36). At the same time the overwhelming external evidence favors the longer reading, which, he affirms, requires either that it was an interpolation "at a very early date in an influential and widely used manuscript" (rendered unlikely, he claims, in "the fluid text critical environment of the first two centuries of the Christian era") or would call for an al-

(?) D.C. PARKER, *Codex Beza. An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* (Cambridge 1992) 95-96, 118-119.

(?) PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 261-278.

ternate explanation: a common dependence of Mark, Paul, and Luke on “a single underlying source, probably oral” (35-36).

Though Billings favors the longer reading as “the most attractive and likely,” he observes that the shorter “cannot yet be dismissed altogether on internal grounds”, since the disputed words (vv. 19b-20) are in large measure non-Lukan in style, but especially if they should reveal a theology alien to the third gospel (36) the next logical task.

## 2. Non-Lukan Theology

Chapter 5, “The Non-Lukan Theology of the Disputed Words”, therefore asks whether Luke-Acts in general embraces a theology of Jesus’ death as a vicarious atonement for sins — a view clearly evident in the disputed words. After reviewing many scholarly judgments, Billings admits that Luke-Acts does not focus on the death of Christ as an atonement of that nature, but rather portrays Jesus as “the one who must suffer in accordance with the divine will (θεῖ)” (44) and as one who died as an innocent/righteous martyr (45-48). Yet, Billings argues that the Lukan soteriology, properly understood in a “holistic sense”, holds that “the Christ event as a whole is salvific and has salvific efficiency” (59-60), concluding that it is “flawed and ultimately unconvincing” to argue that the theology of the longer reading is non-Lukan (60), for “there is nothing in the disputed words that is fundamentally alien to Lukan theology” (61). (Curiously, however, in later summary statements Billings refers to vv. 19b-20 as “non-Lukan in character” [80-81] and containing “many non-Lukan features in regards to language, style, and *theology*” [131, italics added]).

Billings, of course, recognizes that the relation of Luke 22,19b-20 to the broad Lukan theology of Jesus’ death was discussed at length in Bart Ehrman’s widely-read book on *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*<sup>(4)</sup>. Ehrman argues that a theology of atonement is *not* to be found in Luke and therefore the longer reading must be secondary and an interpolation into the manuscript tradition by those intent on perpetuating “orthodox” theology. After describing Ehrman’s view (48-52), without offering any critique of it, Billings turns abruptly to assess the general likelihood of “routine theological emendation of the [New Testament] text to enhance orthodox theological claims” (54), and he finds that view wanting. Since Ehrman is identified with that viewpoint (52), Billings finds it appropriate to dismiss Ehrman’s interpretations as well.

Until page 53, this reviewer thought he was on a high speed train with Billings, headed straight for a destination marked “Luke 22.19b-20 — a theological emendation”. Suddenly, however, and without warning, Billings has switched to another track and we find ourselves riding with him on an 1880s railroad coach and that among our fellow passengers are Westcott and Hort. These scholars long ago rejected any “deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes”<sup>(5)</sup>, but most of us thought that train had derailed

(<sup>4</sup>) B.D. EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford 1993) 198-209.

(<sup>5</sup>) B.F. WESTCOTT — F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London 1881-1882) II, 282-283.

several decades ago. Yet, Billings concludes, after a brief discussion and two examples, that it is *not* proper to assume that:

... theologically and/or liturgically motivated emendations were made freely as a matter of course during the early centuries by orthodox scribes even where the text presented obvious difficulties and/or embarrassment to its defenders. (56)

Hence, claims to the contrary “must be considered unproven” (57).

That contrary case cannot be presented here, but the present reviewer, for many years, has been identified with the view that the New Testament text frequently has been altered for theological/ideological reasons, and he now finds himself in an awkward position — as a biased critic. To be clear, what is in dispute is not Billings’s or anyone else’s conclusion that the longer reading in Luke 22,17-20 did not arise from theological alteration of a shorter, earlier text. Such judgments about motivation in variant readings do and will forever differ from interpreter to interpreter. What is of concern, however, is the easy dismissal by Billings of the whole enterprise of intentional theologically-motivated textual alterations. To be sure, Ehrman’s work, and — to give a second example — another book by D.C. Parker<sup>(6)</sup> contain a number of instances that may be interpreted differently, but surely the evidence for the textual phenomenon of ideological alteration itself has been clearly established by a plethora of other examples, not only in recent decades but for more than nineteen centuries if the attribution by church writers of such practices to “heretics” is recognized. In fact, theological motivation might be found “once removed” (so to speak) when modern interpreters favor and therefore choose a particular variant because it suits *their own* theology (witness, among a legion of other examples, the egregious case of the Junia/Junias reading in Rom 16,7<sup>(7)</sup>).

But back to Billings: If Luke’s theology allows for vicarious atonement through the death of Jesus, and if the disputed words under discussion thereby can be Lukan in character, then whence did the non-Lukan words in that passage (earlier acknowledged by Billings) originate? And further, how did the shorter reading (now deemed secondary by him) arise and persist? These are treated in the next three chapters.

### III. Sources for the Non-Lukan Content in vv. 19b-20

Chapter 6, “Passover, History, and Liturgy in the Disputed Words”, discusses meticulously the kind of meal envisioned in Luke’s Last Supper, and Billings concludes that the narrative setting (but only the setting) is a Passover meal (71). What are the sources, then, of the more detailed content of the Lukan account, including the longer reading? The answer is that the “Lukan Last Supper narrative has been crafted by the evangelist from two independent traditions”. First, for 22,15-18, a “historical tradition, with the Passover setting and eschatological expectation”, was employed, represent-

<sup>(6)</sup> D.C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge 1997).

<sup>(7)</sup> Cf. E.J. EPP, *Junia. The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis, MN 2005).

ing a pre-Lukan, non-Markan tradition. Second, behind 22,19-20 lies “an interpretative tradition of the same *kerygmatic* roots as that cited by Paul, grounded in the words of Jesus also reflected in Mark”, but a tradition also revealing early Christian liturgical practices (78). So two “very early” Christian traditions, one paschal and one liturgical, underlie the Lukan account (79), and the acknowledged non-Lukan words in the longer variant are explained, not as originating from emendation of the shorter reading, but by dependence, independently, of Paul, Mark, and Luke on a common oral *kerygma* (80). Hence, “that the substance of Lk. 22.19b-20 is non-Lukan in character does not necessarily require the conclusion that it is not part of the original text of Luke” (80-81).

Much is controversial in this entire subject of Lukan theology of Jesus’ death, and Billings has explored widely and deeply to develop his position, which certainly has its independent value and usefulness. Other interpreters of Luke’s gospel, however, may wish to assess its success on additional intertextual, literary, and exegetical grounds, and textual critics will continue to ponder whether the theology implied in vv. 19b-20 is Lukan or not.

#### IV. The Rise and Persistence of the Shorter Reading

##### 1. *Scribal Misunderstanding or Error*

If, as Billings believes, the longer reading was part of “the original text of Luke”, how can he account for the origin and staying power of the shorter reading, especially in face of the overwhelming support for the longer? In Chapter 7, “Erroneous Scribal Emendation”, he addresses this question by examining the most common explanations: scribal misunderstanding and scribal mistake. The former, as Billings views it, refers to an intentional deletion of vv. 19b-20 due to a scribe’s failure to understand that the meal described is, at least in its setting, the Passover meal (which had four cups). Such a misconception is understandable several decades removed in time and locale from the meal’s Jewish origins, and so “the Gentile scribe of D or one of its ancestors”, it is argued, acted rather to remove the difficulty of the two cups and the bread-cup sequence and to bring “the Lukan account into harmony with the Markan and Matthean forms, both of which know only one cup” (83). Billings, however, rejects this solution because, for the scribe involved to be perplexed by the cup-bread-cup sequence to the extent of excising the second cup, one would have to assume that the liturgy of the Christian meal was fixed and widely known. But Billings documents at length the fluidity of the Eucharist in the New Testament and early Christianity (84-86).

He also dismisses unintentional scribal error as responsible for the shorter reading because the sense-line structure of D makes it unlikely, but especially because Luke 22,15-20 was “an integral part of the *kerygma*..., “recalled and recited during the course of the earliest celebrations” (88; see also item [ii] on 131). Consequently, Luke would have incorporated the oral tradition known to him (the longer reading), and “the words of institution were far too important and familiar for careless mistakes to be perpe-

trated..." (89)<sup>(8)</sup>. Billings brings interesting data to this discussion, but two points arise: (1) He cannot have it both ways, namely, that liturgical forms were fluid in this period (84-86), but also basic, authoritative, and widely familiar (88-90), even though he claims both in the same sentence (88, lines 13-17, where he attempts to distinguish between "fluidity of practice" and the Eucharist as an "integral part of the *kerygma*"). (2) Billings's argument functions entirely within the framework of his earlier conclusions, thereby excluding some other possible explanations. That is, his position (a) that the longer reading's theology of vicarious atonement is not inconsistent with the rest of Luke's thought on Jesus' death, and is therefore Lukan and has priority, means, for him, (b) that the shorter reading cannot be understood as an intentional elimination of that vicarious theology in the interest of maintaining consistency with Luke's non-vicarious views. But the validity of both these conclusions is questionable, and I would suggest, on the contrary, that the obviously vicarious theology of vv. 19b-20 can be viewed as inconsistent with Lukan theology (à la Ehrman, et al.), so that an intentional, theologically motivated emendation (excising vv. 19b-20) is certainly a viable option. So, here again the validity of either line of argument — intentional or non-intentional removal of vv. 19b-20 — much depends on the validity of the conclusions reached on the Lukan/non-Lukan nature of the theology resident in Luke 22,19b-20 as compared with the rest of the Lukan writings.

Then too, when Billings speaks of Luke incorporating a well-known liturgical formulation into his gospel (88), contrariwise a scribe just as well could utilize a liturgical formula as a model for emending a text that neglected to record the expected formula — hence, in this instance, altering and (in the scribe's mind) correcting the pre-existing shorter reading by adopting and inserting the longer. The latter is all the more likely should (as is plausible) the additional material not conform in style and (contrary to Billings) not comport with Luke's theology. Again, the crucial issue of Lukan / non-Lukan theology of Jesus' death in vv. 19b-20 arises, and, in my judgment, Billings appears not to have considered seriously enough other probable options for the presence of vv. 19b-20 or for the prior existence of the shorter reading, and, in my view, Ehrman's analysis of Lukan theology should not too easily be ruled out. Naturally, however, each interpreter is entitled to his/her own interpretation, just as each observer is entitled to critique the arguments employed in its support.

## 2. *Maintaining Secrecy of the Eucharistic Formula*

Chapter 8, "The *Disciplina Arcani*", pursues further how, if the longer reading is original, the shorter reading could have been derived from it — an explanation Billings considers essential if the genuineness of the longer is to be sustained. Here he discusses (and rejects) the view, primarily of Joachim Jeremias<sup>(9)</sup>, that the shorter reading is an intentional abbreviation of the

<sup>(8)</sup> Favorably citing F.C. BURKITT, "On Luke xii 17-20", *JTS* 28 (1927) 178.

<sup>(9)</sup> J. JEREMIAS, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London 1966 = German '1960), 156, cited by BILLINGS, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, 91-92; Jeremias's book is cited in this connection also on 95, 96, 107, 109, 112, and 123-124.



longer in the interest of keeping secret the sacred formula of the Eucharist. Once more Billings offers much interesting and relevant material in this longest chapter, and he affirms that "the scribe of D was neither stupid or careless but, conversely, wrote the shorter text because it came to him in his exemplar," and further "we must conclude that the emendation preserved by D is to be attributed to a scribe or copyist of the period who intentionally altered the text of Luke's Gospel as it came to him by omitting vv. 19b-20 from the exemplar..." (132-133, see 177). This brings us closer to the interesting and unexpected thesis that is distinctive in the book.

### 3. *Avoidance of Persecution for Assumed Cultic Practices*

Part III, "A Sociological Analysis", inquires whether this "intentionally abbreviated text" (lacking vv. 19b-20) might have served "to safeguard the community *cultus* against misinterpretation and misunderstanding by outsiders" (136). Chapter 9, "The Text as Window", provides descriptive material on the risks to Christians in the Roman Empire from their worship practices. Chapter 10, "'Thyestean Banquets' and 'Oedipodean Intercourse'", pursues the same theme, but now focusing on the Christian community meal and on charges of cannibalism (including eating human flesh and drinking blood) and sexual deviancy practiced by early Christians in their rites—charges leveled in the early centuries, as documented by an array of early Christian writers (151-164).

Finally, Chapter 11, "Why Codex Bezae Was Altered: A Sociological Explanation", brings us back, full circle, to an early section of the book (19), where Lyons is claimed as the provenance of Codex Bezae. Billings, who had admitted that "the early history of Codex Bezae is uncertain and obscure" (13), now cleverly ties in the allegedly truncated reading in manuscript D (lacking the second cup and the vicarious aspects of the body and blood) with the severe persecution of Christians in Lyons (in 177 CE), an event reported by Eusebius as due to "Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean intercourse" (167). Billings claims that the deletion of vv. 19b-20 occurred within the context of this Lyons persecution environment and involved altering "the parent text of the recension of Luke's Gospel contained in Codex D" so as to remove the cannibalistic overtones and thereby reduce the danger (172). The words, "This is my body", were left as a "cue" to the Christian initiates, who could then fill in the missing words during their celebration of the ritual (173). To be sure, such an apocoptation could have happened under similar circumstances somewhere in the Roman empire, but can it be linked assuredly to Lyons? And how can a late second century persecution be connected with a Greco/Latin manuscript that originated about 400 CE?

Billings claims that Codex Bezae "was produced in, or brought to, Lyons at an early date, probably from Galatia" and that the shorter reading in Luke arose between 150-200 CE in "the parent text" of Codex Bezae (172, emphasis added). Can these claims be substantiated? It is apparent that a Lyons provenance of Codex Bezae is closely intertwined with the validity of Billings's hypothesis, and one of our early quandaries now is answered: Why was Parker's magisterial book on Codex Bezae (1992) not cited in connection with the provenance of that manuscript (except enigmatically at 19

n. 39), especially since Billings does refer to Parker's treatment of D's text and its date? (15-19). The provenance of D has prompted numerous theories, and one of the earliest placed its origin in Southern Gaul, specifically Lyons. However, since 1926, with one exception, no serious defense of Lyons has been offered<sup>(10)</sup>. The exception, L. Holtz, will be mentioned momentarily. As noted earlier, Parker, in his virtually exhaustive discussion in 1992, treats ten theories (including Lyons) before selecting Berytus as D's place of origin<sup>(11)</sup>. This discussion of provenance was continued at a noted conference in 1994 and published two years later<sup>(12)</sup>. It contains three papers on provenance, presented in the context of Parker's recent analysis of the issue. One paper argued for South Italy/Sicily, another for Egypt, and the third, by L. Holtz, reopened the Lyonnaise origin, and Parker responds to each, though more in detail with respect to the Lyons proposal<sup>(13)</sup>. While each of the many provenance hypotheses has its strengths and weaknesses, it is fair to say that the case for Lyons is wanting, due largely to Parker's meticulous study of D's numerous correctors. For example, the eight correctors from 400 to 500 CE reflect Greek texts of the gospels and Acts used in Eastern Christianity, and then lectionary annotations were made by Hand L between 550-600 CE when Codex D was in Syria<sup>(14)</sup>. The following two centuries are silent, and the next certainty is that Codex Bezae was in Lyons in the ninth century and remained there until the sixteenth, when Theodore Beza presented it to Cambridge University. Its presence in Lyons in the ninth century, even if the codex had been there already for two centuries, can hardly qualify as an "early date" (172), and Parker's reconstructed history of the codex effectively rules out its arrival at Lyons before 600 CE<sup>(15)</sup>. Therefore, much (though not as much as we would like) is known about the journey of Codex Bezae from its place of origin to Lyons and beyond, and the evidence militates against the claim that Codex Bezae was in Lyons at an "early" date.

Billings, of course, does not claim a direct connection of D (originating ca. 400 CE) with Lyons in 177 CE — which would be an anachronism — but only with a presumed parent of D. There is, however, no direct second century evidence — no manuscripts or patristic witnesses — for the shorter reading, though a complex case can be made that the general, overall kind of text underlying D goes back to that period. Yet, such a second century exemplar would be several manuscript generations removed from D. Billings's case would be stronger if Irenaeus (Bishop of Lyons from 178 CE), who of-

<sup>(10)</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 261-262. Upon examination, neither the book by A. SOUTER, revised by C.S.C. WILLIAMS, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London 1954) 24, nor the article by J.C. COOPER, "The Problem of the Text in Luke 22.19-20", *LQ* 14 (1962) 39-48 (see 48), cited by BILLINGS (*Do This in Remembrance of Me*, 19 n. 42) advances an early Lyons provenance — they simply repeat views then current.

<sup>(11)</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 261-278.

<sup>(12)</sup> D.C. PARKER — C.-B. AMPHOUX (eds.), *Codex Bezae*. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994 (NTTS 22; Leiden 1996).

<sup>(13)</sup> PARKER — AMPHOUX, *Codex Bezae*, as follows: J. IRIGOIN, "L'écriture grecque du Codex de Bèze", 3-13 (South Italy or Sicily); L. HOLTZ, "L'écriture latine du Codex de Bèze", 14-55 (Lyons); A.D. CALLAHAN, "Again: The Origin of Codex Bezae", 56-64 (Egypt); Parker's responses, 332-334.

<sup>(14)</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 282.

<sup>(15)</sup> PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 281-283.

ten used a text akin to the type found broadly in D, were known to have used a text of Luke 22,17-20 that contained the shorter reading. Billings repeats a common, older view that "the exemplar of Codex Bezae may have been brought to Gaul (perhaps by Irenaeus ...) around 170 CE" (19). But the evidence is against Irenaeus possessing a text lacking vv. 19b-20, for he has several passages that refer, not only to the bread as the body, but also to the cup as blood, etc. (e.g., *Haer.* 4.17.5; 4.18.4; 4.33.2; 5.2.2-3), though the scriptural passage/s to which he refers (if any) cannot be determined and perhaps he was reflecting liturgical oral tradition. Billings, of course, is aware of these "longer" Eucharistic passages in Irenaeus because he quotes three of them in other connections (50, 123, 172). Assurance, therefore, that an ancestor of D with a similar shorter reading was to be found in Lyons in the second century cannot be given, and its reality can only be speculation—and wild speculation if Codex Bezae did not reach Lyons until the seventh or perhaps the ninth century. Nonetheless, Billings pronounces it "quite reasonable" that a scribe in the "climate of fear and danger" following the 177 persecution might omit vv. 19b-20, thus "removing the most objectionable cannibalistic overtones", as well as ritual elements such as drinking blood, and words like "remembrance" and "covenant" that "would have evoked images of a *sacramentum* among pagan readers" (173-174), and, says Billings, "The tangible consequence of that social history is manifested in the famous D manuscript at the point of the Lukan institution narrative" (177). And here he rests his case.

Why is establishing a Lyons provenance for Codex Bezae so important for Billings? The reason is already clear: his hypothesis regarding the origin of the shorter text in Lyons in the second century requires that a parent or ancestor of Codex Bezae — the only Greek manuscript to carry that reading — be present at that place and time. Such a (hypothetical) manuscript, then, could account for the lack of vv. 19b-20 in Codex Bezae two centuries later. The weaknesses of the hypothesis have been noted above, and it is unfortunate that Billings, in his selective use of Parker's work, did not interact seriously with the latest data and the most meticulous analysis on this controversial matter of Bezae's provenance, especially when that study obviously was at hand. It is not that he would have to agree with Parker's conclusion, but Billings's claim for Lyons must at least be defended if his hypothesis on the shortening of the D text of Luke 22,19-20 is to be respected or accepted.

\*  
\* \*

Billings summarizes his arguments and conclusions in a three-page "Conclusion" (175-177), followed by an extensive bibliography (178-204) and indexes of passages and authors (205-211).

This review might be described as "hard-hitting" and perhaps as "harsh" in its critique of some prominent points in Billings's argument, but I have felt compelled to respond forthrightly, though I hope fairly, to the substance and mode of his case as it appears to me. I reiterate that he has brought a large measure of interesting and informative material that is relevant to his approach and to the direction taken by his argument. Indeed, the book makes

interesting reading, at points leaving the reader anxious to learn the next turn of events. I also wish to acknowledge that the general contextual approach applied to his text-critical problem is in line with the current practice of assessing variation-units in their full contexts—not only their immediate contexts in a particular writing, in the larger New Testament, and within Christian history, thought, and practice, but also their broad socio-cultural environments of Judaism and the Hellenistic/Roman worlds. Billings's book-length treatment of a single variation-unit is exemplary of that general approach, and it illustrates (as the saying goes) that "it takes a village" to do textual criticism. Also, he has demonstrated that each textual variant has its own narrative to be uncovered. Though I may opt for a different "story" in a given variant reading, and though I have questioned the relevance of some material Billings brings to his study (largely, perhaps, because my views go in a different direction), he nonetheless has been willing to assess aspects of early Judaism (Chapters 6 and 8), of esoteric thought in Late Antiquity (8), of the Roman world (10-11), and, naturally, of early Christian history, theology, and practice. This basic approach is sound in principle, even if one rejects the adequacy of some lines of argumentation and differs with specific conclusions, and Billings is to be commended for undertaking the daunting task and for his attempts at a fresh and creative outcome. After all, the traditional text-critical "principles" or "canons of criticism" are anything but "rules" that can be applied mechanically or employed in isolation from a variation-unit's full environment. The text-critical discipline will profit in proportion to the quantity and quality of studies that embrace a contextual approach.

10 Litchfield Road  
Lexington, MA 02420, USA

Eldon Jay EPP

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Thomas RÖMER, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History. A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2006. x – 202 p. \$100.00

«Il n'y a pas d'histoire deutéronomiste!» Ce qui peut ressembler à un titre d'une quelconque revue à sensation est en fait une thèse défendue par plus d'un exégète sérieux depuis une quinzaine d'année. Ces exégètes remettent en question la fameuse hypothèse de M. Noth sur la composition de Jos – 2 Rois. L'un des premiers fut Otto Eißfeldt dans son *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (édition allemande: Tübingen 1956). Plus récemment, c'est un ouvrage de C. Westermann, *Die Geschichtsbücher des Alten Testaments. Gab es ein deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk?* (TBü 87; Gütersloh 1994), qui souleva quelques questions fondamentales. Il fut suivi par E. Wurthwein, A.G. Auld, E.A. Knauf, H.N. Rösel, A. de Pury, Ph. Guillaume et quelques autres. Les deux principales objections sont les suivantes: il y a trop de contradictions à l'intérieur des livres eux-mêmes ou entre les livres pour que l'ensemble puisse être attribué à un seul «rédacteur» ou «auteur»; les différences entre les livres sont considérables et chacun a une individualité très marquée. Il est plus naturel de penser que chaque livre est né dans un milieu propre et qu'il a connu une histoire propre.

L'ouvrage de Th. Römer sur la question se justifie donc amplement. Peu de spécialistes étaient au demeurant mieux armés pour entreprendre l'aventure. Th. Römer a en effet publié plusieurs études sur le sujet et il en connaît très bien l'historique après avoir rédigé avec A. de Pury «L'historiographie deutéronomiste (HD). Histoire de la recherche et enjeux du débat», *Israël construit son histoire. L'historiographie deutéronomiste à la lumière des recherches récentes* (éd. A. de Pury – Th. Römer – J.-D. Macchi) (Le monde de la Bible 34; Genève 1996) = *Israel Constructs its History. Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* (JSOTS 306; Sheffield 2001). Le lecteur francophone pourra aussi se reporter à la discussion entre Ph. Guillaume, «Étude Critique. L'historiographie deutéronomiste: No Future!», *ETP* 135 (2003) 47-57 et Th. Römer, «Réponse à l'étude critique de Philippe Guillaume», *ETP* 135 (2003) 59-62.

L'ouvrage que nous présentons se subdivise en six chapitres. Le premier contient une brève présentation des livres qui font partie de la soi-disant Histoire Deutéronomiste. À ce propos, le lecteur notera la lecture du texte dans sa forme canonique précède la recherche diachronique proprement dite.

Le second chapitre consacré à l'histoire de la recherche commence, non par les découvertes du siècle des Lumières, mais par l'exégèse rabbinique et

patristique. Dans ce bref résumé, il faudra noter les noms d'Andreas Masius (ou Maes; Lennik [Bruxelles] 1514 – Zevenaar [Arnhem] 1573) et de Spinoza (1632-1677), un des pionniers de l'exégèse critique. L'A. passe en revue tous les grands noms de la recherche, mais il consacre plus d'espace, comme il se doit, à M. Noth, puis à l'école de Göttingen (R. Smend) et de ses multiples rédactions postexiliques (DtrG, DtrP, DtrN...), et à celle de Harvard (F.M. Cross) qui se contente de deux rédactions principales, l'une préexilique et l'autre exilique. Il parle ensuite des «néo-nothiens», J. Van Seters et S.L. McKenzie, puis des critiques faites à l'hypothèse de M. Noth et à l'idée d'une «histoire» deutéronomiste.

Th. Römer, quant à lui, continue à défendre l'idée d'une «histoire deutéronomiste», non pas d'une «historiographie» deutéronomiste (36-37). En effet, le genre littéraire de ces livres est assez éloigné de ce que les historiens grecs entendaient par «histoire» et encore plus de ce que l'on entend aujourd'hui par historiographie. Mais il s'agit de toute manière d'une tentative de comprendre le passé en créant un récit cohérent. Th. Römer avance deux arguments principaux pour justifier l'existence de cette «histoire deutéronomiste». (1) Tout d'abord, il existe un certain nombre de thèmes qui lient l'ensemble Dt – 2 Rois. Le plus important est celui de la critique des «autres dieux» (*'ēlōhīm 'āhērīm*). Un autre thème est celui de la déportation et de l'exil. Enfin, le Deutéronome, qui se présente comme une série de discours d'adieu de Moïse, fournit le modèle des autres grands discours de l'histoire deutéronomiste (41). (2) L'A. reprend ensuite un élément essentiel de la thèse de M. Noth: l'ensemble Dt – 2 Rois est clairement structuré en plusieurs périodes. Après le temps de la «fondation» (Dt), nous avons la conquête (entre Jos 1 et 23), le temps des Juges (entre Jg 2,6-19 et 1 S 12), les débuts de la royauté (entre 1 S 12 et 1 R 8), l'histoire des deux royaumes séparés (entre 1 R 8 et 2 R 17) et la fin du royaume de Juda (entre 2 R 17 et 2 R 25) (37).

En conclusion de cette histoire de la recherche récente, notre auteur estime que nous sommes arrivés à un «temps de compromis» entre les différentes théories en concurrence (41-43). La suite de l'ouvrage présentera donc une proposition personnelle qui tente de résoudre le conflit opposant l'école de Göttingen à celle de Harvard, tout en maintenant l'essentiel de la thèse de M. Noth. Th. Römer propose quant à lui une triple rédaction: une première série de textes rédigés à l'époque de Josias pour répondre à la propagande assyrienne; une rédaction exilique durant la période néo-babylonienne; une rédaction postexilique à l'époque perse. Il reprend donc des éléments des diverses écoles tout en s'appuyant également sur quelques intuitions de I.W. Provan et N. Lohfink (42-43).

Le troisième chapitre pose les bases de cette hypothèse en trois temps. L'A. discute d'abord de l'identité des «Deutéronomistes», puis du texte clé de 2 R 22-23, et offre enfin une analyse minutieuse de Dt 12. À propos des Deutéronomistes, il affirme qu'il s'agit d'un groupe de scribes actifs à la cour royale de Jérusalem à partir du 8 siècle avant notre ère et qui jouissaient d'une relative liberté dans leur activité littéraire. Le récit de 2 R 22-23 n'est pas à prendre au pied de la lettre. Il s'agit d'un récit construit sur le modèle, connu à l'époque, de la découverte d'un document ancien et souvent d'origine divine. Ce document sert en fait à justifier une décision royale susceptible de

rencontrer une certaine opposition (51-52). Ceci dit, Th. Römer ne met pas en doute qu'il y ait bien eu une «réforme» religieuse et politique sous le roi Josias. Il ne doute pas de l'historicité des personnages tels que le prêtre Hilqiyahou ou le scribe Shafân qui ont dû être des piliers de la réforme. Enfin, il distingue trois rédactions successives dans le chapitre central de Dt 12 qui traite de la centralisation du culte: Dt 12,13-18 remonte à l'époque de Josias; 12,8-12 réinterprète la loi de la centralisation du culte dans le contexte de l'exil babylonien; 12,2-7 date de l'époque perse et insiste sur le rejet des cultes «illégitimes». Les trois rédactions correspondent à trois séquences qui sont bâties sur le même schéma. Quelques différences essentielles dans la manière de parler de la présence de Dieu permettent de dater les trois rédactions.

Les chapitres suivants étaient cette hypothèse. Le quatrième traite de la rédaction contemporaine de la réforme de Josias rendue possible par le déclin de l'empire assyrien. La propagande royale assyrienne devient par ailleurs une source d'inspiration pour les scribes de Jérusalem qui appartiennent au parti nationaliste et favorisent le *risorgimento* du petit royaume de Juda. C'est dans les documents d'alliance du royaume néo-assyrien et dans ses codes législatifs qu'il faut chercher la source de la théologie et de la terminologie chères au Deutéronome dont la première édition comprend Dt 6,4-5; 12-25\*; 28\*. Les récits de conquête assyriens fournissent la base littéraire des récits de conquête du livre de Josué (Jos 6-12\*). À cette histoire de la conquête s'ajoute une chronique des rois de Juda et d'Israël qui légitime la dynastie de David et présente Josias comme un *David redivivus*. Elle aussi s'inspire de documents assyriens du même type. Il n'existe à ce stade que «fragments» juxtaposés, mais non une œuvre complète puisque, par exemple, il n'existe pas encore de «livre des Juges».

La période néo-babylonienne (cinquième chapitre: 107-164) est la période la plus importante et Th. Römer lui accorde le plus d'espace. C'est alors que naît l'histoire deutéronomiste proprement dite. Ses «auteurs» ne sont ni des prêtres conservateurs qui vivent du passé, ni des prophètes révolutionnaires qui rêvent d'un futur idéal, mais des «mandarins» qui veulent d'abord comprendre le présent et proposent des solutions adaptées (111-112; selon la théorie de A. Steil, disciple de M. Weber). Si les prêtres préfèrent le mythe et les prophètes l'utopie, les «mandarins» construisent l'histoire. C'est à l'époque de l'exil que sont composés les grands discours deutéronomistes (Dt 1-3\*; 5\*; 6,1-3.6-7\*.10-25\*; 8\*; 9,1.4-6\*; Jos 1,1-9\*; 23; Jg 2,6-3,6; 1 S 12,1-15\*; 1 R 8\*; 2 R 17\*; cf. 117, 122-123) et la loi qui sert de base à la réforme de Josias devient «loi de Moïse». De cette époque date aussi le récit de la traversée du Jourdain et l'invention de la «période des Juges» qui unit la conquête à la chronique de la royauté.

À la période perse est dédié le sixième et dernier chapitre. La communauté postexilique est formée d'une élite qui revient de Babylone. Cette élite se compose de prêtres et de laïcs qui excluent des rouages du pouvoir la population restée au pays et instaurent une religion de la «stricte observance». D'où les grands thèmes des ajouts datant de cette époque: l'exclusivisme du point de vue ethnique et religieux, le monothéisme, mais aussi l'ouverture à la diaspora. Avec ceci nous arrivons toutefois à la fin de l'évolution: l'histoire deutéronomiste laisse la place à la *tora* qui devient le fondement de l'identité d'Israël dans le pays et dans la diaspora. C'est à cette

rédaction de l'époque perse qu'il faut attribuer le récit de la «découverte du livre» (2 R 22–23\*) et des textes comme, entre autres, Jos 24 et Dt 34,4.10–12 (180–183).

Le volume est accompagné de deux index: textes cités et auteurs cités. La bibliographie est limitée aux «chapeaux» qui précèdent les paragraphes. Sur bien des points les propositions de Th. Römer sont plus que séduisantes, cohérentes et présentées de façon pédagogique. Certes, il reste des marges et des ombres que l'A. lui-même n'ignore pas. Par exemple, la division de Dt 12 en trois grandes couches rédactionnelles repose sur une solide argumentation (répétitions, reprises, corrections, etc.). Mais dans le reste de l'ouvrage, la séparation entre trois rédactions deutéronomistes est plus affirmée que vraiment prouvée. Les renvois bibliographiques sont certes les bienvenus, mais ils ne remplacent sans doute pas une justification en bonne et due forme. Par ailleurs, certains récits sont traités assez rapidement. Il fallait centrer l'étude sur des textes clés, il est vrai, et c'est sans doute la raison de ces choix.

L'ouvrage rencontrera aussi, et c'est normal, une certaine résistance sur l'un ou l'autre point. L'A. ne m'en voudra pas si j'en mentionne quelques-uns de ces problèmes. Je prends comme exemple le fameux récit de 2 R 22–23. Selon l'A. le récit primitif ne comportait que 2 R 22,1–7\*.9.13aa; 23,1.3–15\*.25aa. À mon avis, ce récit est par trop fragmentaire. Le lecteur passe d'un bref récit sur les travaux de réfection du temple à la requête d'un oracle, puis au renouvellement de l'alliance et à un résumé de la réforme religieuse de Josias. Il n'a pas de vrai lien logique entre ces trois parties et il est difficile d'échapper à l'impression qu'il doit manquer quelque chose. Le récit a pu être retravaillé, entre autre en ce qui concerne l'oracle de Hulda, mais il doit «tenir sur ses pieds», même dans sa version la plus ancienne. Par ailleurs, 2 R 23,3 mentionne le «livre», mais ce motif devrait appartenir à la rédaction de l'époque perse, non à celle de l'époque assyrienne. Le récit de la prise de Jéricho (Jos 6\*), autre exemple, est d'un style hiératique et liturgique qui nous paraît plus proche de celui du passage du Jourdain (Jos 3–4\*) que de celui de la bataille de Aï (Jos 8\*). Mais l'A. attribue les récits anciens de Jos 6\* et 8\* à la rédaction du temps de Josias (88–89), tandis que le récit de la traversée du Jourdain serait exilique (134). Plus loin, il reconnaît lui-même la parenté de ces textes et admet qu'il est difficile d'y distinguer des couches rédactionnelles (180). À propos de Jos 6, l'A. mentionne l'existence d'un texte plus court dans la LXX; il y a de nombreux cas du même type dans le livre de Josué (135, n. 58) et ailleurs, le plus flagrant étant celui de 1 S 17, l'histoire de David et Goliath. Ne valait-il pas la peine de tenir davantage compte de ce fait? Tout cela pour dire qu'il est plus simple de trouver des couches rédactionnelles dans les textes législatifs, voire dans les discours, mais que notre exégèse bute assez souvent sur les récits, qu'il s'agisse de leur délimitation et plus encore de leur datation. Le travail de Th. Römer constitue toutefois un excellent outil de travail, très bien documenté malgré sa concision, et qui n'a pas son pareil dans les parutions actuelles, et son auteur mérite toutes nos félicitations. Un seul regret, en terminant: le volume vaut son pesant d'or puisque chaque page vaut plus ou moins un demi dollar!



Thomas WAGNER, *Gottes Herrschaft: Eine Analyse der Denkschrift (Jes 6,1–9,6)* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 108). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2006, xiii-340 p. 17 × 4,5. €105 – \$168

This monograph is a revision of the author's doctoral dissertation at Kirchlichen Hochschule Wuppertal. As the title suggests, this study analyzes the theme of "the Reign of God" as a guiding motif in the so-called *Denkschrift*, "Isaiah Memoir" (Isa 6,1–9,6). By utilizing a literary-critical investigation (literarkritische Untersuchung) of the various redactional layers and comparing cross-references (Querbezüge) with inner-biblical and ancient Near Eastern texts, the author delineates the literary growth of the *Denkschrift* and presents the theme of "YHWH's Reign" which connects the entire collection that was originally independent (40-41).

Chapter one surveys the history of research pertaining to the theme of God's reign in twentieth century scholarship, followed by the history of research on the *Denkschrift*. The theme of God's reign, Wagner states, exists from the start of the prophet's vision of YHWH sitting on the throne (6,1) and is one of the central topics of biblical theology in the twentieth century. The survey reviews major scholars such as M. Buber, S. Mowinckel, T. Vriezen, G. von Rad, and W. Schmidt on the kingship of YHWH from prophetic and psalmic texts with regard to biblical theology and history of religion. Subsequent generations of scholars, such as T. Mettinger, H.-D. Preuß, J. Jeremias, H. Spieckermann, M. Brettler, and S. Kreuzer, are further examined with their interpretation on cultic or conceptual relations to the kingship of YHWH. The survey continues with reviews of the scholarly treatment of the composition of the *Denkschrift* as the core of Isaiah 1–12 over against the backdrop of the Syro-Ephraimite War. Starting with K. Budde, other key commentators including O. Procksch, A. Bentzen, V. Hemtrich, G. Fohrer, O. Kaiser, up to H. Wildberger are succinctly discussed. It further reviews up-to-date scholarly works: redaction-critical methods of H. Barth, M. Sweeney, U. Becker, J. Barthel, W. Beuken; and composition-historical methods of E. Blum and U. Berges.

Chapter two provides an overview of the main texts with detailed form-critical structural analyses, addressing their linguistic organization and literary layers. After delimiting the *Denkschrift* as 6,1–9,6 in light of the introduction of the throne vision (6,1) and the shift of the setting from southern Judah to northern Israel (9,7), the author presents the internal coherency of the basic sections alongside redactional extensions with regard to the multileveled literary growth. Thus, Isa 6,1-13 is a combination of the coherent unit of 6,1-10a.b.11 extended by 6,10b.12-13. Next, 7,1-8,15 is composed of 7,2-8a.9-14.16-17a as the basic layer glossed by 7,1.8b.15 (v. 17b as a historicizing gloss), and 7,18-25 as well as 8,1-4.6-8 as the basic layer glossed by 8,9-10 and 8,11-15 with an editorial transition in 8,5. Finally, 8,16-9,6 is a collection of 9,1-6 with its extensions of 8,21-23.18-20.16-17, which was attached to the unit of 6,1-8,15. These compositional layers with further minuscule details present one of the most updated contributions from redaction-critical scholarship.

Chapters three through five focus on the basic layers of each text unit,

followed by chapter six with its discussions on editorial insertions and additions and chapter seven with its summary of the redactional organization of the Denkschrift and recapitulation of the concepts concerning God's reign.

Chapter three focuses on the vision account in Isa 6,1-13. Here the author delineates key epithets and titles in comparison with ancient Near Eastern traditions. The six-winged seraphs share similarity with the Egyptian iconography of the ninth and eighth centuries BCE that display the function of symbolism not only for divine protection but also for creative power. The divine epithet "hosts" (צבאות), meaning either a terrestrial or a celestial army, likewise entails Egyptian influence, from which the broader sense of the throne seat was adapted in the biblical notion of the divine epithet associated with the eighth century Jerusalem temple cult. Furthermore, the motif of YHWH's reign involves four key titles, אֲדֹנִי, מֶלֶךְ, קֹדֶשׁ, and כְּבוֹד. Correlated with pertinent Psalmic and Canaanite mythological texts and thereby signaling to the pre-exilic context, these titles imply the universalization of the motif of YHWH's reign beyond the temple to the worldwide realm. Additionally, the hardening of the heart in vv. 9-10 along with the acknowledgment of guilt and cleansing in v. 6 are intricately connected to and held together by the motif of YHWH's reign. Finally, the author identifies the genre of Isaiah 6 not as the commissioning vision or inaugural vision but rather as the divine court vision (cf. 1 Kgs 22,19-22; Jer 29,13-14).

Chapter four focuses on the word of YHWH to the king and the people in Isa 7,1-8,15. With regard to Isaiah's argument with King Ahaz (Isa 7,1-25), the author compares its motif with pertinent Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions for expounding the contents and contexts. Accordingly, the demand of faith toward the divine assurance of the dynasty in Isa 7,2-8a.9a corresponds to the ancient Near Eastern coronation rituals in which the divinity assures victory over the enemies to the enthroned who is endowed with faith. This common criterion of faith in 7,9b, which picks up the similar formulation of 28,16aβ.b, is linked to 7,2-8a.9b. Likewise, the so-called Immanuel oracle, which originally consisted of 7,11-14.16-17a, was conjoined by 7,15, a secondary link influenced from 7,21-22 and by 7,17b as an extended judgment gloss. Therefore, 7,1-17 is built up with two narratives, 7,1-9 and 7,11-17, which were conjoined by 7,10, and as a whole refer to the same Syro-Ephraimite War in 7,2-9a which announces YHWH's protection of Judah; 7,11-14.16-17a points to the time when those threatening countries will be destroyed. Subsequently, the extended oracle of 7,20-25 is added to 7,18-19 with the motif of YHWH's using foreign powers as instruments for YHWH's purpose; this parallel motif can be found in the Assyrian inscriptions.

In addition, with regard to YHWH's word to the public (Isa 8,1-15), 7,1-17 and 8,1-7 share similar motifs and situations despite the shift from third person to first person speech. Citing various linguistic and thematic parallels, Wagner argues that 8,1-15 was attached to 7,1-17 with several implications. First, the same announcement of YHWH for the imminent fall of the Syro-Ephraimite alliance in both texts functions as a warning to Judah. Second, as evidenced by 8,6-8, this prophecy encompasses Isaiah's warning against his contemporaries, who supported the policy of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition in Judah. Third, the notion of YHWH's utilization of foreign rulers against

Ephraim and then against Judah signifies the concept of the expansion of YHWH's reign from Judah to the worldwide realm.

Chapter five focuses on the hope for the renewal of the Davidic rule in Isa 8,16–9,6. Here the author notes a new historical situation for 9,1–6. If the vision at the time of the death of King Uzziah (6,1–13) is an event of the past and if the following reports of the political events with the backdrop of the Syro-Ephraimite War (7,1–8,15) have a present sense, then the hope for the light with the coming ruler amid darkness (9,1–6) points to the future (207). The coming ruler pronounced in 9,5–6a is expected to implement righteousness (צדק), as a part of the divine order in the world. This motif parallels not only pertinent Psalms but also Egyptian coronation rituals which contain five throne names for the coming ruler. Likewise, the titles in Isa 9,5b correspond to those of the Neo-Assyrian rulers, both with four throne names, suggesting that the invasion of the country in 9,4 anticipates YHWH's initial defeat of the invaders which will then lead to the installation of a new ruler as the king with the assigned titles in 9,5. Accordingly, what Wagner calls "Pharaonisierung" of the Judean king involves the intention of Isa 9,1–6 to depict the expansion of the Judean boundary northward and the restoration in the size of the Davidic kingdom in comparison with the Egyptian and Neo-Assyrian territories. With regard to the compositional connection, the proclamation of the new ruler in Isa 9,1–6 precedes the "Historisierung" (historicizing) of the events in Isa 8,23a $\alpha$ <sup>7</sup>–b. In spite of the similarities to the ancient Near Eastern prophecies of the coming ruler, Isa 9,1–6 denotes a contrasting concept: whereas the Egyptian and Neo-Assyrian prophecies associate the task of military success with the human king, the Isaianic prophecy points to YHWH who is to defeat the enemies and assign a human king to the task of establishing the reign of God. This chapter concludes with the dating of the announcement in Isa 9,1–6 for which Wagner assigns 8,23a $\alpha$ <sup>7</sup>–b to the time of King Josiah and 9,1–6 to the time of Josiah's predecessor, King Hezekiah.

Chapter six considers the whole of the Denkschrift and reconstructs complex editorial extensions. To do so, Wagner categorizes five different layers: (1) extensions with judgment announcements, (2) extensions with salvation announcements, (3) Immanuel extensions, (4) historicizing additions, and (5) the literary conclusion of the Denkschrift in Isa 8,16–23. First, concerning the judgment/exile extensions, both 6,12.13a.b $\alpha$  and 8,11–15 share the common language and the motif of the prophet's encounter with YHWH, with the effect of "Eschatologisierung" of history in that YHWH's announcement to the people by the prophet will now be true under all circumstances. Second, concerning the salvific extensions, 6,10b $\beta$  with its notion of the conversion of the heart and its depiction of the language and motif of Trito-Isaiah (ישי, 7,3; 10,20; רפא, 19,22; 30,26; 57,18–19; 60,5) is a postexilic insertion into 6,10a.b $\alpha$  and 6,11. Also, 6,13b $\beta$  with the term "holy seed" (Ezra 9,2) denotes the setting after the return of the exiles and, thus, an addition to the prophecy of destruction in 6,13b $\alpha$ . Likewise, 7,21–22 is another salvific addition, with the notion of the economic surge that assumes the temple reconstruction setting (Hag 2,18–19). Third, concerning the Immanuel extensions, 7,15 ("curds and honey", 7,21–22) is a secondary

insertion between 7,14 and 7,16-17a, just as 8,9-10 reflecting “no concrete historical situation” should be considered an addition in the Persian period. Fourth, concerning the historicizing additions with which the texts became bound to historical events, 7,1; 8,5; 7,8b; 7,4b.17b.20; 8,7 can be identified. 8,5 makes an editorial connection to 7,10, just as 7,1 adds a temporal sequence as an introduction to 7,2-17. In similar ways, 7,8b and 7,4b.17b.20; 8,7 as glosses apply historical situations to the basic layers. In so doing, the redactors aligned the individual subunits into a chronological sequence (cf. 2 Kings 15–16), which Wagner calls “Synchronization”. Fifth, concerning the literary conclusion of the Denkschrift, Wagner considers 8,16-23 as the final additions to the core Denkschrift, which then editorially ties to 9,1-6, establishing a new context. Through the synchronization and historicizing toward the present form of the text, the once-given announcement of the reestablishment of Judah in the time of Hezekiah was extended to the Deutero-Isaianic context of the exilic and postexilic periods (cf. Isa 49,7).

This book clearly represents a major contribution to Isaiah scholarship. First of all, it employs form-critical and redaction-critical methods in the examination of the Denkschrift, thereby presenting fresh insights on the multifaceted layers of the text. Building upon most recent and solid scholarly works by Barth, Becker, Barthel, Blum, and Berges, Wagner explicates the basic layers and various redactional insertions. This study presents not only thorough examinations of those detailed layers but also admirably innovative categorizations of various editorial phenomena, such as historicizing, chronologizing, glossing, synchronization, and eschatologization. Although these categorizations may yet need to be defined, compared, and contrasted with further evidences, they help explain the possible redactional activities and rationales for each pertinent phrase. Furthermore, such analyses of editorial distinctions are backed up by linguistic and thematic connections from other biblical texts, both within the rest of Isaiah and elsewhere, especially in the Psalms. By comparing unique words and motifs with related texts, Wagner aligns various layers with corresponding historical settings and sequences. Equally impressive are the comparative analyses in light of ancient Near Eastern literature and motifs, both Assyrian and Egyptian, which further enrich the textual meaning as well as literary growth of the texts.

Areas for debate remain available because of the nature of scholarship. First, while major German-speaking works have laid the foundation for this work, certain English-speaking works, plus works in other languages, were not considered in the survey and interpretation. Though studies on the Denkschrift may not have been the central focus of recent Isaiah scholarship, scholars including Clements, Beuken, and Williamson have presented substantial theories which deserve closer examination. Next, this study certainly advances recent scholarship with methodological sophistication beyond the old school of *ipsissima verba*, “authentic” sayings, versus secondary oracles. However, dating the judgment sayings mostly preexilic and the salvation sayings predominantly exilic or postexilic does not fully take into account the complexities of either the transmission or the final stage of redactional layers. Recent Isaiah scholarship has presented a strong—if not convincing—argument that many of the judgment oracles in chapters 1–4 of Isaiah may be dated later, and vice versa (cf. Vermeulen, Ackroyd, Clements,

Steck, Sweeney, Seitz, Williamson). To make things more complicated, Sweeney's four stages of redactional development in Isaiah or Williamson's proposal of Deutero-Isaiah's reshaping of Proto-Isaianic texts were scarcely considered in the methodological orientation. This leads to another crucial lacuna in this study. Whereas the text of the Denkschrift is meticulously analyzed, one wonders how this literary corpus stands in the larger sections, such as chapters 1–12, and in the entire book of Isaiah. This does not mean that the Denkschrift must be read only in light of the unity of the book. Nevertheless, it is insufficient to focus on the Denkschrift in isolation, just as if one were to analyze the so-called Servant Songs, Isaiah Apocalypse, or even chapters 36–39 (cf. Mettinger, Seitz, Berges) independently from the rest of the book. Moreover, while this study is primarily diachronic in nature, investigation and interpretation on the synchronic dimension might be helpful, especially for the place and function of the Denkschrift in the final form of the book (cf. Rendtorff, Childs, Melugin, Blenkinsopp). Last but not least, the thematic or theological focus on the reign of God has not offered tangible clues to comprehending the authorial intention or editorial composition. The title introduces this theme with "an analysis". Perhaps such a title beckons further clarification in terms of methodology and issues, as this study does address redaction, history of religion of the ancient Near East, and even biblical theology.

This critique is by no means intended to undermine the fine achievement of this study. The Denkschrift, a corpus that grew out of textual development, was intricately influenced from the historical contexts and surrounding culture and religiosity. Wagner's study is a major contribution that informs us of such outcomes with the finesse of meticulous scrutiny and presentation.

Methodist Theological School in Ohio  
3081 Columbus Pike  
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Hyun Chul Paul KIM

Katharine J. DELL, *The Book of Proverbs in Social and Theological Context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. x-225 p.  
15 × 22. £ 48.00 - \$ 85.00

As suggested by the title and stressed by the author, the purpose of this handsome hardback is to explore the social contexts for the varied material of Proverbs and to investigate its theology within OT theological traditions. Pursuing such a goal, the six-chapter book has logically a symmetrical two-part organisation. After a short introduction, Dell scrutinizes in the first three chapters successively the social context(s) of Prov 1–9; 10,1–22,16 and 22,17–31,31. The second part of the volume, instead, is dedicated to the question of Wisdom theology. It passes through examining the mention of Yhwh in Proverbs (chap. 4), its theological context (chap. 5) and influences of other OT traditions (chap. 6), to end with a general conclusion where some final reflections are elaborated.

In her work, Dell follows the simplest division of Proverbs into seven collections (1–9; 10,1–22,16; 22,17–24,22; 24,23–34; 25–29; 30; 31). The author goes through these sections one after another to outline and discuss the social situation(s) behind the text in its oral and written stages.

Thus, as far as Prov 1–9 is concerned, after underlining its noticeable duplex context – educational (as seen in the instructions) and theological/religious (poetic discourses) – Dell focuses here on the first issue, leaving the second for later theological analysis. She summarises scholarly opinions on social backgrounds of the Collection, which are predominantly three: court (school), school “of some kind” and family. Indicating the four underlying issues to face – the purpose of the material; its oral/written origin; the structural unity; and the dating question (31–32) – Dell tries to examine the purpose and unity issues of Prov 1–9 through surveying the ten instructions. The unity of each section is then revealed to be guaranteed by an exhortative atmosphere, ethical general concerns and the close alignment of the parental instruction with the Wisdom’s authority. These unified blocks of material are supposed to be already atoms of Prov 1–9 and “to carve up these texts into more original or less, or oral/written, is futile activity” (47). The educational purpose of the Collection is reaffirmed, and the author considers either the family or school as plausible context of the instructions, brought together probably in “a final editing stage” rather than composed by one person, given their huge difference of style, theme and concern.

Exploring the context(s) of Prov 10,1–22,16, Dell first synthesizes, as she has done previously, suggestions of other authors, and then analyses the contents of proverbial sentences from the perspective of their purpose and structural unity. This contentual survey, which appears less detailed (than with Prov 1–9), is carried out in dialogue mainly with Heim’s work on proverbial clusters in 10,1–22,16. It allows the author to discover behind the maxims the many contexts like educational, legal or cultic and even “often no particular context at all beyond the general ethical one” (63). Moreover, we find rather a “fragmentation which reveals oral clusters” than some unity in the observed material. In such a situation, as Dell points out after the scholarly consensus, the family/folk/tribal settings seem “the most likely origin” of the analysed Collection.

Going through the rest of Proverbs, Dell analyses quickly its contents from the perspective of social context and leaves the question of structural unity somewhat in second place, especially when dealing with Prov 22,17–24,22 (perhaps owing to its complexity). The investigation leads to the bipartition of the material according to the social context(s). First, the affinity between 1–9; 22,17–24,22 and Prov 31 posits a similarly educational setting, even though, as underlined by Dell, the contexts can differ from home school to more formal school (22,17–24,22) or court school (Prov 31) (Prov 30,1–14 was added to this group because it “also seems to indicate a court context” [88]). Secondly, we have Prov 24,23–34; 25–29 and 30,15–33, which, like 10,1–22,16, contain mostly ethical general sayings and so reveal a “more home-grown Israelite maxim-making” context from family/folk/tribal settings (88). The division of Proverbs’ social contexts into educational (school of all levels) and ethical (family/folk/tribe settings) categories is intelligent and helpful. It could give, however, a false impression that there

might have been two separate milieus each possessing its own “wisdom products”. This picture doesn’t correspond well with the material of Proverbs wherein we find many pithy maxims as well as popular images and types among well-organised instructions of Prov 1–9 (cf. the ant [6,6–8]; the lazy [6,10–11], repeated almost verbatim in 24,33–34) and 22,17–24,22 (cf. 23,24 or 23,29–35 [the drunken], curiously left untouched in Dell’s analysis) or “my son” style commands among the universal proverbial sentences of 27–29 (cf. 27,11, mentioned by the author herself). The two mentioned contexts did have a high level of interaction between them and the discussion appears rather more complicated (see 22,17–24,22).

The exploration of Proverbs’ theological settings begins in chapter four with an investigation on the references to God in the Collections. The question of how the religious elements relate to the so-called secular ones in the same blocks of instructions and/or sayings is a concern for the author. Such an examination gives Dell grounds to suppose that those two aspects existed “side by side” already “in the earliest wisdom tradition” and “the oral formation of Proverbs may well have contained a crucial religious and even specifically Yahwistic element” (123–124). This can be seen from the instructional sections of 1–9; 22,17–24,22; 30,1–9; 31,10–31; where the Yhwh references, with the key concept of the “fear of Yhwh”, and the figure of Wisdom are proved to be integral part of the educational material rather than an addition to the text. In the case of the proverbial sections of 10,1–22,16 and 25–29, the religious sayings and surrounding non-religious ones appear to have circulated independently (perhaps with some level of interaction, as we might imagine) and there may have been hence no editorial “baptism” of secular material. Dell rejects then any “Yahwehization process” of Proverbs in later redaction phase by means of the Yahweh maxims, which are suggested to have only the function “to reinforce the messages of other Proverbs within a religious context” already existed there (117). Thus, the merging process of the religious and ethical aspects in Proverbs seems to have taken place in the oral stage. In my view, this is an important assertion, supported additionally by the pan-religious character of the Ancient Israel (cf. R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l’Ancien Testament* [Paris 1960], II, 89). However, it runs the risk of totally ignoring the possibility of a redactional Yahwehization process, considering that there was probably a *conscious* Yahwehization of faith in Israel during the (deuteronomic) period when Proverbs was supposed (as Dell herself suggests later) to receive its final form (cf. E.S. Gerstenberger, *Theologien im Alten Testament. Pluralität und Synkretismus alttestamentlichen Gottesglaubens* [Stuttgart 2001] 172–179).

The integration of Wisdom’s theology into the wider OT theological framework is examined in the fifth chapter. Here, the fulcrum of argument is the creation passages in Proverbs. A thorough review of these texts has revealed what can be characterized as the creation faith of the sages. God appeared as creator and custodian of the world order. The first aspect receives its emphasis mainly in Prov 1–9 (precisely, 3,19–20 and 8,22–31), while the second is found in other Collections. Dell reflects again on the Yhwh mentions in the context of the debate on wisdom’s theology. Having already rejected the latter-redaction hypothesis, she now sees the consistent use of the divine name of Yhwh in Proverbs as a strong argument to consider the God

of the sages as the same God of the entire OT. The idea of a different Yhwh is rather “patently absurd” (147). There are only differences in emphases. Considering this alongside the monotheistic and universalistic features of wisdom literature, and insisting on the fact that the creation faith is observed as an essential part of Yahwistic tradition, the author, like some other scholars, proposes to integrate wisdom and Yahwism.

Dell completes the discourse on the social and theological context(s) through the analysis of the many echoes of OT texts in Proverbs. As she claims, it is about an exploration of influences on Proverbs from other OT genres and traditions, and not vice versa. Combining her own study with other scholars’ observations, the author indicates the three principal ways in which Proverbs is linked with other thoughts: the prophetic links (found mainly in Prov 1–9; especially 1,20–33); the deuteronomic (1–9; 22,17–24,22); and the cultic-psalmic (mostly in 10–31). Although the questions of the direction and the period of influences are still open, these data confirm eloquently the place of Proverbs within the Hebrew Bible and the integration of wisdom theology in the OT theological traditions. This is the final note supporting the principal thesis Dell pursues to prove throughout her work. As stated in the general conclusion, wisdom in Proverbs, with its ethical and educational dimensions as social contexts and with its specific theological elements, is to be considered an integral part of the OT. Moreover, it is to be considered “a mainstream tradition within OT life and thought” (200).

Besides a few comments above concerning the book’s contents, some observations could be added.

First, the volume, written in a bright style, is highly readable. The addition of a general index which includes references of authors, topics and biblical books generally makes the book user-friendly. It lacks, however, a separate biblical index. In my opinion, even though this is not a strictly exegetical work, an index of main biblical references would not have spoiled the book’s value and scholars as well as students would have had a useful instrument for a quick consultation with more profit.

Secondly, among many strong points of the volume’s contents, it is necessary to highlight the presence of the thorough discussions Dell conducted continually with many scholars. These overall debates appear very helpful to grasp an overview on the *status quaestionis* of varied problems. On this matter however, for a more complete survey, a few scholars could have been consulted. I refer to Alonso Schökel in the debate on the crucial question of oral versus literary stages (chap. 2) (cf. L. Alonso Schökel, “Forma de los Proverbios. Estudio comparativo”, in L. Alonso Schökel – J. Vélchez Líndez, *Sapienciales I. Proverbios* [Nueva Biblia Española; Madrid 1984] 117–150, especially 139–141) as well as Niccacci (whom Whybray, cited by Dell [66], relied on) for the discourse on literary units of 22,17–24,22 (chap. 3) (cf. A. Niccacci, “Proverbi 22,17–23,11”, *SBFLA* 29 [1979] 42–72).

Thirdly, the religious dimension of Proverbs could be confirmed by the insistency on the model of the *just (righteous) man* against *the wicked* throughout the book as well as the equation between righteousness and wisdom in opposition of wickedness and folly (as seen clearly, for instance, in Prov 23,24–25). To what extent this recommended righteousness is the virtue derived from the observance of *Torah* remains a debatable issue. But



the contemplation of at least some “religiousness” in Proverbs (and generally in the wisdom literature) is more than obvious. It constitutes one of the few guiding threads of the book and represents an important “meeting point” with deuteronomic, prophetic and cultic-psalmic traditions. Dell doesn’t overly underline this aspect in the analysis of Proverbs’ theological context. Nonetheless, it could be seen in some measure from her brief but thorough review of echoes of other OT texts in the Collections.

Full of valuable insights and practically flawless in form (I have found only few typing errors: 22,16–24,22 instead of 22,17–24,22 [88] and 10,1–22,17 instead of 10,1–22,16 [187,191]), Dell’s book is certainly an important contribution to the scholarly debate on the Proverbs social contexts and wisdom theology within the Hebrew Bible. With this precious work, we can say now figuratively, wisdom has taken a great and secure step towards full “reconciliation” with other OT traditions.

Via del Serafico, 1  
I-00142 Roma

Dinh Anh Nhue NGUYEN

Joseph BLENKINSOPP, *Opening the Sealed Book*. Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity. Grand Rapids, Michigan - Cambridge, U.K., William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006. XX-315 p. 15 × 23. \$ 25.00-£ 14.99.

Der bekannte Alttestamentler konnte die Wirkungsgeschichte des Jesajabuches begreiflicherweise in seinen zwischen 2000 und 2003 in der Anchor Bible erschienenen dreibändigen Kommentar nicht mit aufnehmen; sie wird in dem vorliegenden Werk nachgeliefert. Ähnlich verfuhr Brevard S. Childs, auch er Verfasser eines Kommentars zum Jesajabuch (255, n. 8 angeführt), in seinem 2004 im selben Verlag erschienenen Werk *The Struggle to Understand Isaiah as Christian Scripture*, mit dem Unterschied, dass Childs der Wirkungsgeschichte von der LXX bis in die Postmoderne nachgeht, während der Verf. bei der Entstehung des Buches beginnt und beim Neuen Testament endet. In der Einleitung wird darauf hingewiesen, dass teilweise frühere Veröffentlichungen verwertet werden (vgl. XIX-XX; auch 67, n. 26).

In Kap. 1 (1-27) wird nach Informationen über Buchwesen und Autorschaft im Alten Orient und in der Antike (1-4) die Entstehung des Jesajabuches als ein Prozess kontinuierlicher Anreicherung gesehen. Zu einem solchen Jahrhunderte dauernden und ständig neu interpretierenden Traditionsfluss soll sich heute die gesamte kritische Forschung bekennen (vgl. XVII; 56). Der Rez. hatte mehrfach Gelegenheit, vor diesem Phantom zu warnen, und möchte besonders verweisen auf die Besprechung von O.H. Steck, *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis* (Tübingen 1996) in *Bib* 79 (1998) 271-275. Greifbar ist nur eine schriftliche Hinterlassenschaft des historischen Jesaja und eine einmalige Redaktion, die erhebliche Zeit nach dem Exil in dem sich seiner selbst bewusst werdenden Judentum erfolgt

ist. Der Redaktion ist die eigentliche Autorschaft zuzuerkennen. Redaktionelle Stellen wie Jes 16,13-14 und 19,16-25 brauchen nicht spätere Zusätze zu sein (7-8), und bei Jes 9,14 und 29,10 sollte man nicht von späteren "Glossen" sprechen (10; 100), am allerwenigsten bei Jes 6,13b (100; 205; 226). Apokalyptisierende Züge gehören von Anfang an zur Vorstellungswelt der Redaktion; in den letzten Kapiteln der Gesamtkomposition treten sie sinnvollerweise stärker hervor.

Mit dem versiegelten Buch von Jes 29,11-12, in dem man durchaus eine eschatologische Botschaft vermuten darf (8-11), soll im Licht von Jes 8,16 und 29,18 das Jesajabuch selbst gemeint sein (11-14). Der Verf. ist so kühn, seinem Werk einen entsprechenden Titel zu geben. In Kap. 4 (122) wird er bedauern müssen, dass der Qumran-*paesaer* zu Jes 29,10-12, der seine Auffassung hätte teilen können, verloren gegangen ist. Das versiegelte Buch steht sodann im Mittelpunkt, wenn dem Einfluss des Jesajabuches auf das Danielbuch nachgegangen wird (14-23). Dieser Einfluss ist zu erwarten, da man zur Zeit der Entstehung des Danielbuches bereits mit Gesetz und Propheten lebte. Der Verf. wird noch in anderen Zusammenhängen auf Abhängigkeit hinweisen können (u.a. 176-178; 229-230; 232-234; 261-263). Ob aber der Topos des Verbergens und Versiegeln von Büchern in Dan 8,26; 9,24 und 12.4.9 unter dem Einfluss von Jes 8,16; 29,11-12 und 29,18 stehen muss? Dafür ist er denn doch zu verbreitet. Entsprechendes gilt, von Jub 1,4 einmal abgesehen, für die versiegelten Bücher einer späteren Zeit (23-27), wobei das versiegelte Buch des Gesetzes in CD 5,2 Erwähnung verdient. Das versiegelte Buch in Offb 5,1-8,1 ist vor allem von Ez 2,8-3,3 inspiriert (vgl. Offb 10,2.8-10). Das wie geschlachtete aussehende Lamm von Offb 5,6, das die Entseigelung vornimmt, ist kaum von äthHen 90,8 abhängig (25), da sich die Paschalammtypologie des Neuen Testaments geradezu aufdrängt.

In Kap. 2 (28-55) wird zu Recht eine Umwandlung des Prophetenbildes festgestellt (vgl. bereits XVII-XVIII; 5). Eine vollständige Darstellung des Unterschieds zwischen historischem Prophetentum und biblischem Prophetenbild darf man freilich nicht erwarten. Der Verf. äußert sich in diesem Zusammenhang zum "Prophetenschweigen" des Deuteronomisten, der ja Amos, Hosea, Micha (von Moersch) und Jeremia unerwähnt lässt (38-43). Ihre radikale Unheilsverkündigung soll ihm nicht ins Konzept gepasst haben. Wie ist aber dann zu erklären, dass die deuteronomistisch geprägte Redaktion der Bücher Amos, Hosea und Jeremia mühelos damit umgeht?

Um eigentliche Wirkungsgeschichte handelt es sich erst beim Jesajabild des Chronisten und des Siraziden (43-46). Im außerbiblischen Bereich werden die *Vita Prophetarum* und Flavius Josephus befragt (46-48). Schließlich kommt die Tradition vom Märtyrertod Jesajas zur Sprache (49-52). Man beachte, dass Jesaja nicht in jeder der zahlreichen Rezensionen und Ausgaben der *Vita Prophetarum* "first in the series" ist (47). Dass auch in dieser Schrift wie im Martyrium Jesajas die Zersägung vorkommt, ist dem Verf. natürlich bekannt, der Leser erfährt es aber nicht. Es wird nicht jeden überzeugen, dass die Leidensberichte der Evangelien von der Märtyrerleibende beeinflusst sein sollen (52-55).

In Kap. 3 (56-88) wird die Genese des Jesajabuches mit nachexilischen Frömmigkeitsbewegungen in Verbindung gebracht, wobei mit der Forschung

über eine Vorgeschichte der klassischen "Sekten" gerätselt werden muss. Diese Bewegungen sollen das Milieu sein, in dem sich der anreichernde, interpretierende Traditionsfluss bewegt hat. Gegenüber dieser Auffassung, die die weite Teile des Werkes durchzieht, ist zu betonen, dass sich in nachexilischer Zeit mit persischer Billigung das Judentum als solches konstituiert. Zu diesem Vorgang gehört die gleitende Abspaltung der Samaritaner und die wachsende Überzeugung, dass das Volk Gottes nur aus Heimkehrern aus dem Exil besteht. Eine so bedeutungsvolle Entwicklung darf nicht Sektenbildung genannt werden. Mit dem Judentum entstehen aber nun als Wesenselemente das Gesetz, die Propheten und wenigstens noch die Psalmen. Jede spätere Gruppierung setzt diesen Kern des Kanons und in ihm das Jesajabuch voraus. Es hat kein durch Sektenbildung bedingtes interpretierendes Anwachsen des Buches gegeben; es ist vielmehr vor jeder Sektenbildung eine abgeschlossene Gegebenheit. Die Kanonbildung ist denn auch nicht in dem Ausmaß zu problematisieren, wie die Auffassung des Verf.s es mit sich brächte (vgl. 57; auch 27; 98).

In Kap. 4 (89-128) bieten die Qumranschriften, die nunmehr auch nach der Ansicht des Verf.s auf das abgeschlossene Jesajabuch zurückblicken, reichlich Stoff für eine wirkungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Die *paesaer*-Exegese wird charakterisiert und, was jesajanische Texte betrifft, vollständig angeführt und erläutert. Zitate und Anspielungen werden dagegen nicht vollständig herangezogen (vgl. 92). Nicht wenige tauchen ohnehin bei anderer Gelegenheit auf. Vermissen wird man die Stelle 1 H III,10, die sich an Jes 9,5 anlehnt.

In Kap. 5 (129-168) folgen die neutestamentlichen Erfüllungszitate. Sie haben eine Fülle von Literatur hervorgebracht, auf die der Verf. nur selektiv eingehen kann. Das Jesajabuch wird sinnvoll als "das fünfte Evangelium" präsentiert (129-137). Die Gemeinsamkeiten der Schriftauslegung in Qumran und im Neuen Testament lassen sodann auch ohne Sensationslüsternheit die Frage aufkommen, ob Jesus und sein Anhang in der Täuferbewegung und in der Qumrangemeinde wurzeln (138-147). Eingehend und kompetent werden die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäusevangeliums besprochen (147-168).

Die Verwurzelung in der Täuferbewegung und in der Qumrangemeinde ist in der Tat eine "challenge of history", vor der man nicht zurückzuschrecken braucht, wenn sie zu einem "deeper understanding of and appreciation for the faith" führt (vgl. XVI). Die vierte jüdische Sekte der Zeloten bleibt übrigens im gesamten Werk aus dem Spiel, obwohl der Apostel Simon einen einschlägigen Beinamen trägt. Der Verf. geht nicht darauf ein, dass Jesus sich beim Abendmahlstermin anscheinend nach dem von der Qumrangemeinde verteidigten traditionellen Sonnenkalender gerichtet hat (vgl. A. Jaubert, *La date de la cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* [EB; Paris 1957]). Dass die Entstehung der Urkirche auch in rein historischer Sicht trotz allem etwas Einzigartiges ist, wird dem Leser leider kaum vermittelt.

Manche Einzelheiten in Kap. 5 fordern zu einer Stellungnahme heraus. Bei "der nach mir kommt" in Mt 3,11 par. denkt weder der Täufer noch der Evangelist an Jüngerschaft (141-142); vielmehr geht es wie in Mt 11,3; 21,9; 23,39; Joh 1,15.27.30; 6,14; 10,8; Apg 13,25 und 19,4 um "the One to Come" (so richtig 160; 165; 291). In Apg 13,15 und 19,4 steht übrigens statt *opiso* die

Präposition *meta*, die der Verf. 142, n. 27 vermisst. Entgegen der Einschätzung des Verf.s (144-145) behandelt Paulus "Apollon, den Bruder" (1 Kor 16,12) auffallend diskret. Angemerkt sei noch, dass *oriens* (neben *occidens*) für Tacitus in Hist. 5,13 ein geläufiger geographischer Terminus ist (157).

In Kap. 6 (169-221) werden ergänzend zu Kap. 4 und 5 bestimmte Titel behandelt: (die) viele(n), der Weg, die Gerechten, die Auserwählten, die Knechte des Herrn, die Heiligen, die Armen, die "Umkehrenden", die Trauernden, die Frommen. Es muss wieder Einspruch erhoben werden gegen die Auffassung, dass die Titel schon im Jesajabuch und namentlich in den Psalmen auf Konventikeln oder gar Sekten zu beziehen sind. Man erhält viel nützliche lexikographische Information; um den Einfluss des Jesajabuches ist es jedoch manchmal schlecht bestellt. Der Titel "die Frommen" (*h<sup>a</sup>sîdîm*) kommt z.B. im Jesajabuch überhaupt nicht vor (vgl. 219). (Es könnte von Interesse sein, dass Hieronymus *hāsîd* mit *sanctus* wiederzugeben pflegt, gewiss unter dem Einfluss der Vetus Latina, die über das griechische *hosios* durchweg diese Wortwahl trifft.) Es stellt sich noch die Frage, ob die Selbstbezeichnung der Urkirche als "der Weg" (181-182) in Anbetracht der semantischen Möglichkeiten des Terminus so zuversichtlich von Jes 40,3 herzuleiten ist. Im Neuen Testament geht es bei Jes 40,3 immer darum, Christus den Weg zu bereiten (vgl. Mt 3,3 par.; Lk 1,76).

In Kap. 7 (222-250) bilden das Exil und der heilige Rest ein eigenes Thema. Die Idee des Restes, die doch gemeinorientalisch ist (vgl. 222), soll Jesaja von Amos übernommen haben (224-225; 230; vgl. XVIII und 31). Herausgestellt wird die bedeutende Rolle von Exil und Heimkehr im Sektenschrifttum der griechisch-römischen Zeit (230-241). Im Milieu dieses Schrifttums, zu dem der Verf. auch das Danielbuch zählt, betrachtet man sich gern als den heiligen Rest am Ende einer langen Zeit der Dekadenz nach dem Exil. Die Interpretation des Jesajabuches kann in der Tat zu dieser Bewusstseinsbildung beigetragen haben (241-250). Festzuhalten ist jedoch, dass die Redaktion selbst, die gesamtisraelitisch denkt, zwar Getreue und Abtrünnige unterscheidet, aber mit der Idee des heiligen Restes nichts Sektierisches verbindet.

Dem heiligen Rest unter dem pflanzlichen Bild des "heiligen Samens" (Jes 6,13b) und des "Sprosses der Pflanzung" (Jes 60,21) ließen sich noch Jes 4,2-3 (in anderem Zusammenhang 100, 204 und 208 erwähnt) sowie Jes 11,1.10 zuordnen. Ferner findet sich, wie die Redaktion die Texte verstanden wissen will, in Jes 7,14 und 9,5-6 das Motiv der "Geburt", d.h. der Vermehrung des Volkes. Einschlägig ist auch Mich 5,2. Es sei verwiesen auf J. Becker, *Isaías - der Prophet und sein Buch* (SBS 30; Stuttgart 1968) 49-62.

In Kap. 8 (251-293) erhält abschließend der Jahweknecht die verdiente Aufmerksamkeit. In den sogenannten Jahweknechtliedern, aber auch an sonstigen Stellen nimmt der Verf. ein wirkliches Lehrer-Schüler-Verhältnis wahr. In Jes 42,1-4 soll jedoch ursprünglich von Kyrus die Rede gewesen sein. Der interpretierende Traditionsfluss und das dazugehörige Milieu wird vorausgesetzt. Für den Rez. ist Jes 40-66 ein zusammenhängender Beitrag der Redaktion, die hier wie in den redaktionellen Partien von Jes 1-35 pseudepigraphisch ex persona Isaiae spricht. Die Jahweknechtpassagen, die nicht auf vier zu begrenzen sind, haben immer zu dem komplexen

Redaktionsgebilde gehört. Über Gesichter des Knechtes lässt sich spekulieren, nicht über seine Identität; er ist von Anfang an Israel. Der Redaktion ist zuzubilligen, dass sie von Jes 54,17 an von individuellen Knechten spricht.

Unberührt von der Problematik der Jahweknechtpassagen kann der eigentlichen Wirkungsgeschichte dieser Texte in jüdischen Schriften nachgegangen werden (259-268). Die Qumranschriften werden gesondert behandelt (268-282), vor allem der eingehend besprochene Hymnus 4Q491c (272-282). Zuletzt wird gefragt, wieweit der qumranische "Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit" und Jesus Züge des Jahweknechts tragen (282-293). Der Auffassung, dass der historische Jesus die Texte auf sich bezogen hat (289-290; vgl. auch 136-137), kann man nur zustimmen. Beachtung hätte Lk 1,54 verdient, wo in sprachlicher Anlehnung an den LXX-Text von Jes 41,8-9 immer noch Israel als Knecht Gottes erscheint.

Zu dem vor allem auf Jes 53,11 zurückgehenden messianischen Titel "der Gerechte" sind folgende Hinweise angebracht. In äthHen 38,2 steht der Titel nur als Variante, dafür aber eindeutig in äthHen 53,6 (zu 264). In diesen Zusammenhang gehören auch die in Kap. 6 (192, n. 56) angeführten Stellen, an denen Jesus mit diesem Titel bedacht wird. Hinzuzufügen sind 1 Joh 2,2.29 und 3,7 sowie eventuell 1 Petr 3,18, während Jak 5,6 eher nicht auf Jesus zu beziehen ist. Zur Faszination, die der Titel auf Hieronymus ausgeübt hat, vergleiche man J. Becker, "'Iustus' statt 'iustitia'. Zu einer messianisierenden Übersetzungsweise des Hieronymus", *Textarbeit*. FS P. Weimar (Hrsg. K. Kiesow u.a.) (AOAT 294; Münster 2003) 21-34.

Es fällt auf, dass LXX und Targ im gesamten Werk nur inzidentell herangezogen werden (vgl. vor allem 261 bzw. 266-267). Obwohl die LXX gerade im Jesajabuch sehr eigenwillig übersetzt, schätzt der Verf. sie wirkungsgeschichtlich offenbar so ähnlich ein wie die Handschrift 1QIs<sup>a</sup>, bei der er feststellt, dass sie keine Basis liefert "for a distinctive and consistent approach" (91; vgl. auch 261; 268-269).

Die Literaturangaben stehen bei weitem nicht alle im bibliographischen Index (294-297). Ein Autorenverzeichnis wäre daher zu wünschen gewesen. Geboten wird ein Index of Subjects (298-301) und ein Stellenverzeichnis (302-315). Auf folgende Unstimmigkeit sei aufmerksam gemacht: Im Stellenverzeichnis (312) und an der Bezugsstelle 50, n. 47 muss es 4 Baruch 9,21-22 statt Baruch 9,21-22 heißen (korrekt in 54, n. 56, einer im Stellenverzeichnis nicht vermeldeten Stelle). Es handelt sich um eine der vielen Bezeichnungen für die Paralipomena Jeremiou. Im Stellenverzeichnis steht die Angabe zudem zwischen deuterokanonischen Schriften, was dazu verleitet, an das Baruchbuch im Kanon von LXX und Vg zu denken.

Während es dem eingangs erwähnten Werk von Childs, auf dessen Besprechung in *Bib* 87 (2006) 429-434 hingewiesen sei, ein Anliegen ist, die Schrifterfüllung als Glaubenswahrheit nahe zu bringen, bleibt das vorliegende inhaltsreiche und anregende Werk auf der beschreibenden Ebene. So könnte der Eindruck entstehen, dass die Erfüllung in Christus nur zeitgebundene Auslegungstechnik ist. Blicke das Jesajabuch da nicht doch versiegelt?

## Novum Testamentum

Gordon D. FEE, *Pauline Christology. An exegetical-Theological Study*,  
Peabody (MA), Hedrickson Publishers 2007, 707 pp.

L'essai de G. Fee sur la christologie des lettres attribuées à Paul est monumental. Il est aussi le bienvenu, car les monographies sur le sujet – celles de Kramer, Cerfaux, Kim et Bauckham – se comptaient sur les doigts de la main. Très au fait des problèmes soulevés par son entreprise – peut-on systématiser des propos occasionnels et n'ayant pas la forme de traités? Peut-on et doit-on distinguer entre ce que Paul reprend de la tradition apostolique antérieure et ses propres énoncés christologiques? Peut-on unifier des énoncés christologiques appartenant à des lettres dont il est admis qu'elles ne sont pas toutes authentiques? Y a-t-il ou non un développement christologique et une cohérence d'ensemble? etc. –, Fee réussit à éviter les chausse-trappes et à offrir un parcours intéressant.

Dès le commencement, l'auteur indique bien que son étude sur la christologie entend s'interroger sur l'identité de Jésus, ce qu'il était et est – et qu'il appelle sa personne – en particulier sa relation à Dieu le Père, et non sur son œuvre salvifique, sinon pour ce qu'elle indique de son être. Le paradoxe sur lequel l'étude revient de nombreuses fois peut être ainsi décrit: ce que Paul dit de Jésus Christ ne va en rien contre son monothéisme net – il n'y a qu'un seul Dieu, le Père –, et pourtant, tout au long de ses lettres, il ne cesse d'attribuer au Christ des titres et des prérogatives divines, ce qui, pour Fee, signifie que Paul inclut Jésus Christ dans la définition même de Dieu. Il commente d'ailleurs longuement trois textes clefs où le paradoxe se manifeste le plus: 1Co 8,6; Col 1,13-17 et Ph 2,6-11, textes qui vont lui permettre de répondre à deux questions importantes: (1) comment Paul peut-il sauver le monothéisme, alors qu'il donne au Christ le titre même donné par la bible grecque à Dieu, κύριος (= *Adonai* = YHWH)? (2) Les énoncés sur la préexistence du Christ, en particulier ceux de Col 1,13-17, autorisent-ils à parler de "Wisdom Christology"?

L'ensemble est composé de deux parties, une première, analytique (29-478), où sont passées en revue les affirmations christologiques de toutes les lettres, et une deuxième, reprenant synthétiquement les résultats de la première pour montrer l'unité et la cohérence de la christologie paulinienne (479-619). Les lettres sont présentées (plus ou moins) chronologiquement: 1 et 2 Th (31-83), puis 1 Co (84-159), 2 Co (160-206), Ga (207-236), Rm (237-288), Col et Phm (289-338), Ep (339-369), Ph (370-417), et enfin les Pastorales (419-478). Les chapitres ont en gros la même composition: (1) après un bref exposé sur la lettre étudiée – ce qui l'a occasionnée, sa composition, le ou les problèmes majeurs affrontés, la christologie et sa place, etc. –, (2) un paragraphe présente succinctement et proleptiquement les données christologiques – les titres et leur articulation, surtout ceux de Christ, Fils et Seigneur –; (3) il est alors possible d'examiner les différents énoncés christologiques en leur contexte; (4) deux appendices suivent les analyses, un premier où sont rassemblés dans leur langue originelle, le grec,

tous les énoncés christologiques, selon leur ordre d'apparition dans la lettre, et un deuxième, très utile, avec le nombre d'occurrences des titres et la manière dont Paul les utilise et les combine – Christ, Jésus Christ, Christ Jésus, Seigneur, notre Seigneur Jésus Christ, etc.; avec ou sans article, avec ou sans préposition; titres et prérogatives christologiques et reprenant ceux attribués à Dieu dans la LXX.

Parmi les nombreux les points mis en valeur par les analyses, relevons ceux qui nous paraissent les plus saillants:

(1) Même si l'on peut constater une certaine évolution des premières aux dernières lettres – l'insistance sur la préexistence est plus ample en Col 1,12-17 et Ph 2,6-11; de même le titre de sauveur n'est donné au Christ qu'à partir des lettres de la captivité (Ep 5,23; Ph 3,20; 2 Tm 1,10; Tt 1,4; 2,13) —, elle ne touche pas la plupart des données, comme le dit Fee à propos de 1 Th: "La façon dont Paul parlera du Christ ensuite se trouve déjà en place en 1 Thessaloniciens" (34); en d'autres termes, "la place très haute qu'a le Christ dans la compréhension que Paul a de l'identité de Dieu" (54) est notable dès les premières lettres, ne serait-ce que par l'utilisation du titre *κύριος*, dont la connotation est forte, puisqu'il apparaît en des énoncés reprenant ceux de la LXX, où le titre désigne Dieu (ainsi, 1 Th 3,13 reprend Za 14,5; 1 Th 4,6 le Y 93,1; 1 Th 4,16 le Y 46,6; 1 Th 5,2 Joël 1,15, et 1 Th 5,27 Gn 24,3).

(2) Deux passages, Rm 9,5 et Tt 2,13, où beaucoup voient le Christ déclaré Dieu, sont assez longuement analysés (272-277 et 440-448), et Fee apporte une réponse négative. Mais, ajoute-t-il, cela n'empêche pas l'apôtre d'associer en ses lettres Dieu et le Christ (ex. 1 Th 1,1; 2 Th 1,2.12, etc.) et de donner à ce dernier des prérogatives divines: en lui habite la plénitude de la divinité (Col 2,9), il est avec Dieu le Père sujet de certains verbes (ex. 1 Th 3,11; 2 Th 2,16-17), comme lui et avec lui il nous a aimés (Rm 8,35; Ep 3,19; 5,2.25-27), a envoyé l'Esprit (Rm 8,9; Ph 1,19), est prié et imploré (2 Co 12,8-10; 2 Tm 1,16.18; 4,22), sera le juge à la fin des temps (2 Th 1,7-8; 1 Co 4,4-5; 11,32; 2 Tm 4,1.8.14; voir aussi l'expression "jour du Seigneur") et transformera nos corps en son propre corps glorieux (Ph 3,21), etc.

(3) La prédominance du titre christologique *κύριος* est nette pour l'ensemble du parcours (sauf Ga). Ph 2,9-11 y voit même le nom qui est au-dessus de tout nom, nom divin conféré pour susciter l'adoration et la proclamation de toutes les créatures, en des termes appliqués à Dieu même en Is 45,23 LXX.

(4) La préexistence du Christ n'est pas seulement affirmée dans les lettres de la captivité, mais aussi et déjà en 1 Co 8,6 (où Paul reformule paradoxalement le *shema*, en liant l'unicité de Dieu et celle du Seigneur Jésus Christ, 89), 10, 4,9 et 2 Co 8,9 ainsi que dans les formules d'envoi, telles Ga 4,4-7 et Rm 8,3. La préexistence du Christ, telle qu'affirmée en 1 Co 8,6 et Col 1,15-17 a été interprétée en termes de "Wisdom Christology" par un certain nombre d'auteurs, mais à tort, selon Fee, car rien dans le vocabulaire utilisé ne permet de dire que Paul a identifié le Christ à la Sagesse divine des deutérocanoniques vétérotestamentaires.

D'autres composantes de la christologie paulinienne sont aussi présentées en leur développement et rôle: Jésus comme Fils, image de Dieu, sauveur, messie juif, Adam eschatologique, etc., mais elles le sont dans la ligne indiquée plus haut, à savoir pour souligner et s'interroger sur le monothéisme

paradoxal de l'apôtre. Avec d'autres mots que ceux de Fee, reconnaissons la christologisation massive de la théologie (comme discours sur Dieu) et, réciproquement, la théologisation de la christologie paulinienne; tel est sans doute le résultat principal de l'enquête ici recensée. On dira certainement que ces résultats étaient déjà connus. Certes, mais il fallait une enquête exhaustive pour leur donner une valeur sûre. Nous arrivons ainsi à un deuxième résultat jusque là peu partagé: nonobstant un réel étalement dans le temps — un peu plus de quinze ans —, la structure de la christologie paulinienne, en ses différentes composantes, ne s'est pas fondamentalement modifiée.

Partageant l'avis de Fee sur les deux points précédents et appréciant le sérieux de sa démarche, signalons seulement quelques réticences exégétiques, qui n'entament pas au demeurant la thèse d'ensemble de l'ouvrage. (1) Sans nier que certains énoncés pauliniens parlent explicitement de préexistence (1 Co 8,6; Col 1,15-17), disons qu'il ne saurait en être de même en Ph 2,6-8. Pour Fee, la kénose de Ph 2,6-7a désigne l'incarnation; dans son commentaire, il avait déjà dit à propos de cette kénose: "Indeed, if it does not presuppose pre-existence the metaphor itself has been 'emptied'" (*Philippians* [Grand Rapids 1995] 210, note 78). Je pense avoir montré dans mon propre commentaire (*Philippiens* [Paris 2005] 140-176) qu'en ces versets la kénose ne désigne pas l'incarnation, car aucun des termes utilisés en Ph 2,6-7a ne l'autorise: comment le vocable *μορφή* qui ne s'applique chez les anciens qu'à des êtres visibles, pourrait-il désigner le préexistant? Quant à l'interprétation de la kénose comme incarnation, on ne la trouve pour la première fois chez les Pères qu'à la fin du IV<sup>e</sup> — l'interprétation des Pères des quatre premiers siècles serait-elle pour cela vide? (2) C'est surtout à propos de Col 1,12-17 que Fee se demande si l'on peut, en ce passage, mais aussi ailleurs chez Paul, trouver une christologie sapientielle, plus exactement une identification du Christ avec la Sagesse personnifiée. L'appendice (595-630) est entièrement consacré à cette question. Si le terme *σοφία* est assez utilisé en Col (cf. 1,9,28; 2,23; 3,16; 4,5; et une fois dit du Christ 2,3), Fee pense néanmoins très improbable que Paul identifie le Christ à la Sagesse personnifiée. Il passe en revue tous les termes de Col 1,15-17: *πρωτότοκος*, Christ créé avant toutes choses et *προ πάντων*, comme la Sagesse en Si 1,4a,9a; Col 1,17b analogue à Sg 1,7; le mot *ἀρχή* en 1,18 et *εἰκόν* en 1,15 et qu'on dit reprendre Sg 7,26. Mais, plus que vers une christologie sapientielle, les phrases de Paul pointent, nous est-il dit, vers une christologie du Fils de Dieu, formulée avec des images prises de la Genèse et de la royauté davidique. Bref, une dépendance lexicale et conceptuelle par rapport à la tradition biblique sapientielle serait encore à démontrer pour qu'on puisse continuer à voir une 'Wisdom Christology' dans la réflexion de Paul, mais c'est précisément ce qui manque (325). S'il est effectivement difficile de voir le Christ identifié à la Sagesse personnifiée de Pr 8, Si 24 ou Sg 6-9, la démonstration de Fee est moins convaincante concernant une influence possible. On peut douter avec lui que Paul ait pu connaître le livre de la sagesse de Salomon (605-606), mais cela ne signifie pas qu'il n'a pas pour autant connu le courant sapientiel et ce qui s'y disait de la sagesse. En outre, que Col 1,15-17 ne nomme pas le Christ sagesse, précisément parce qu'il n'y est pas question d'identification, n'interdit pas qu'il puisse tout de même y avoir des allusions aux titres conférés à la sagesse dans la tradition sapientielle reflétée par livres bibliques mentionnés plus haut, distinction à laquelle je suis



moi-même arrivé dans mes études sur Col 1,15-20: l'influence sapientielle y est difficilement niable, même si manquent les raisons pour aller vers une identification.

Les limites du projet, bien définies et justifiées dans l'introduction, s'imposent dans la deuxième partie de l'ouvrage, car si les résultats de la première y sont repris clairement et nerveusement, l'auteur ne fait pratiquement qu'y répéter sa thèse sur la christologisation de la théologie paulinienne, sans aller au-delà. Même s'il est difficile de déterminer exactement et à la manière de S. Kim (*Origin of Paul's Gospel* [Grand Rapids 1982]), comment s'est développée et enrichie la réflexion christologique de Paul, quelle composante a déterminé et engendré les autres, etc., une exégèse serrée de Gal 1 et d'autres passages — ceux par exemple où sont cités les Ps 109/100 et 8, sous forme de *gezerah shawah* — aurait permis de reconstruire en partie la généalogie de la christologie de l'apôtre, et de voir pourquoi ses énoncés audacieux sur la préexistence ont été aussi précoces. Cela dit, tel qu'il se présente, la *Pauline Christology* de Fee constitue un passage obligé pour les essais à venir sur la christologie de Paul.

Via della Pilotta, 25  
I-00187 Roma

J.-N. ALETTI

Luke Timothy JOHNSON, *Hebrews. A Commentary* (The New Testament Library). Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2006. xxxvii-402 pp. 15,5 × 23

Luke Timothy Johnson continues to serve the Church and the academy with yet another fine commentary, this time on the so-called "Epistle to the Hebrews". Deliberately bridging the ecclesiastical and academic worlds, Johnson manages to be both concise and thorough. Though not often explicit in its interactions with scholarship, the text clearly demonstrates familiarity with all the relevant issues and current debates. Following a 60-page introduction, the commentary proceeds in typical fashion: coverage of short passages (averaging 6 to 12 verses) begins with a short introduction, followed by Johnson's translation of the Greek text and brief text critical notes. The commentary then follows, interrupted periodically by excursions on such topics as angels, suffering, Melchizedek, covenant, and sanctuaries.

Johnson begins with a reminder of the interpretive difficulties attending this "beautifully written, powerfully argued, and theologically profound" document (1). Hebrews' murky origins and unknown destination offer a healthy challenge to the historical critical method, while its transcendent "vision of reality" and depiction of Jesus are both unique to the NT and outside the easy grasp of modern comprehension. Finally, this self-proclaimed "word of exhortation" (13,22) "is remarkably stringent in its demands" on its hearers/readers, both ancient and contemporary. Hebrews "calls for unqualified commitment, unflagging perseverance, and the willingness to suffer as a consequence for faith. For present-day Christians who make moral

ambiguity and tolerance for wrongdoing the mark of maturity, and who consider suffering as virtually equivalent to evil, Hebrews is strong medicine, bitter to swallow" (2).

Johnson's introduction is by itself nearly worth the price of the book. His discussion of Hebrews' literary form notes its oral character: it was "meant to be heard as a discourse, rather than seen as a text, experienced as a whole in its unfolding rather than studied in separate segments" (11; cf. also 352, 356-357). Offering "the longest sustained argument" in the NT, Hebrews frequently employs comparative logic (*synkrisis*), expressed in a *minore ad maius* / *qal wahomer* arguments (31). Constituting the "heart" of Hebrews, this logic emphasizes the superiority of the "revelation of God in Christ" over that mediated by prophets, angels, Moses, and Torah (32).

Most helpful is Johnson's introductory consideration of the Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian contexts underlying and informing Hebrews' symbolic world. The cosmology and eschatology of that worldview can be characterized as a "hybrid of Platonic metaphysics and Semitic dualism" (19). From Platonic idealism comes the conviction that the noumenal/ideal realm is metaphysically, epistemologically, and axiologically superior to the material world (18). The ideal realm is more real and valuable than the material one. Bridging these worlds is the temple (19). Johnson later contends Hebrews' portrayal of heaven as the "true sanctuary" is "the great imaginative leap of this composition. All the subsequent argument flows from this simple imaginative premise" (198). Hebrews' Christian convictions have, however, necessitated deviations from Middle Platonism. The temporality of the Christ event disallows a timeless, "ahistorical" Platonic perspective. Hebrews' type/antitype dualism thus acquires a temporal perspective, "turning Platonism on its side", as the things and "events of the past serve as types or examples for the present, which is greater and 'more real'" (20). More importantly, Hebrews' emphasis on the physicality of the incarnation is at odds with the Platonic depreciation of the material. And while "the sort of Hellenistic Judaism represented by Philo remains the best overall symbolic world within which to read Hebrews", it is nevertheless "questionable whether Philo would have understood Hebrews" (28; cf. also 201-202).

From the Jewish context comes scripture and sacrifice. The author is an "extraordinarily comprehensive and thorough reader of the LXX"; in fact, "Hebrews lives within the imaginative world constructed by Scripture" (21). In that world, God, Son and Spirit speak directly to the community through the words of the LXX, further enhancing the oral quality of Hebrews. The Jewish sacrificial system provides the frame of reference for understanding the significance of Jesus' death, even as it transcends that system (27). Johnson also traces the decisive influence of the "experiences and convictions of the nascent Christian movement", establishing many points of contact with Paul and 1 Peter (30).

The situation of the community may be inferred from the text. They were probably Jewish, longstanding members of the Christian community, and subject to shame because of that membership. We may also assume they were sufficiently educated to follow Hebrews' complex argument. Their waning commitment is best attributed to "negative experiences", and not a desire to turn, or return, to Judaism (36). A date of composition between 50 and 70 CE

is “quite possible” (38-40). The discussion of authorship concludes with a reminder: “The author of Hebrews lives within the passion and subtlety of the discourse itself; the life he lived outside the rhetoric is not known to us, and does it truly matter?” (44; cf. also 357-358).

Johnson’s analysis of Hebrews’ Christology amply justifies his claim that “the conception of Christ in this composition is indeed one of the richest in the NT canon” (48). Johnson locates a fitting Christological parallel to Hebrews’ cosmological dualism: “On one side, Jesus is the one who brings salvation to humanity from God (apostle, cause, sanctifier, guarantor). On the other side, Jesus is also a human being who reaches first what all seek (heir, firstborn, pioneer, forerunner). As the one who accomplishes both, he is preeminently the ‘mediator’” (49; cf. also 93). Hebrews’ Jesus is as divine as the Gospel of John’s, and as human as Luke’s; unfortunately the author offers no easy resolution of this paradox (55; cf. also 73, 109, 151). Suffering, which constitutes the “deepest dimension” of Hebrews’ Christology, offers something of a teleological connection between the two natures (52). Demonstrating Jesus’ obedience to God, suffering “was the way through which he became more fully (more perfectly) that which he was, God’s Son” (54).

Like us, Jesus had to respond moment by moment [to the voice of God], and therefore ‘learn obedience’ precisely in and through the stress and pain generated by constantly allowing his present understanding of God and of God’s will to be challenged and relativized by the voice of God that he heard within the circumstances of his everyday life. Hebrews says that Jesus was ‘perfected’ by this process of experiential learning. . . . Jesus grew into his full identity as God’s Son. Although he came into the world as Son, he could only ‘finish’ that project moment by moment, in every response of obedient hearing, and could be ‘perfected’ completely only through the final yes to God in the suffering that is death (151).

Suffering also stands at the center of Hebrews’ vision of discipleship. It will accompany Christian faithfulness, effecting the community’s transformation into “fully mature children of God” (60). This is especially apparent in 12,4-11, which joins the community’s “experience of suffering and shame” to “the very process by which Jesus himself was brought to full perfection as son”. Thus, 12,4-11 is “one of the essential keys to the whole composition, as the author shows how suffering is to be regarded as an education in sonship” (313). Hebrews is here ideologically quite distant from some forms of modern Christianity. Christians who inhabit an entirely reliable, “deeds-consequences” universe may be tempted to view suffering as the outcome of “failed faith” (cf. the “prosperity gospel”), while those pursuing socio-political goals may see human suffering solely as a problem to be solved (59).

Johnson’s near-complete neglect of Jewish and early Christian two-age apocalyptic eschatology represents a major oversight in an otherwise thorough work. This crucial component of Hebrews’ thought-world is readily apparent throughout, appearing explicitly in 1,2; 6,5; 9,9-11; 10,1. Moreover,

Hebrews offers what is perhaps the NT's preeminent formulation of the eschatological implications of the Christ event: Jesus "has appeared once for all at the end of the ages to remove sin by his self-sacrifice" (9,26). And two passages that appear to be espousing Platonic cosmology, 2,5 ("the world to come") and 13,14 ("the city to come"), in fact cohere better within the framework of NT inaugurated eschatology. Both mention a future, "coming" eschatological locale that Jesus has already entered; while not yet a physical reality, the community is present there during their worship (12,22-24; though Johnson deems this passage "entirely an imaginative evocation" [330]). One is therefore hard-pressed to refute the claim that "no other NT writing more systematically and thoroughly embodies the conception of the two ages and the conviction that the transition between them is now in process" (C.P. Anderson, "Who Are the Heirs of the New Age in the Epistle to the Hebrews?", *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*. FS J.L. Martyn [ed. J. Marcus - M.L. Soards] [JSNTSup 24; Sheffield 1989] 255).

Two-age eschatology should then be considered at least as prominent within Hebrews' symbolic world as Platonic metaphysics. However, Johnson rarely, and then only briefly, mentions apocalyptic eschatology (64, 164, 206, 244-245, 273). The sole discussion of the relation of these two "backgrounds of thought" is but a few sentences in length. While commenting on 10,25-39, which warns of the imminently approaching "Day" of the Lord, Johnson notes the "element of eschatological urgency" and the "expectation of a future climax to history". These early Christian eschatological beliefs reflect "one of the ways" Hebrews' "strong Platonic worldview is modified by the symbolic world of Scripture and the experience of Jesus as Lord" (260). In his near complete subsumption of apocalyptic eschatology into Platonism, Johnson stakes out an extreme position, one shared by very few scholars. For the *status quaestionis* of this heavily debated issue, cf. my *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (WUNT 2.223; Tübingen 2007) 3-8; and K.L. Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice* (SNTSMS 143; Cambridge 2007) 1-23.

Recitals of the community's eschatological experiences figure prominently in Hebrews' famous warning passages. Unlike most scholars, Johnson recognizes their significance. Thus, 2,1-4 "is key to the argument of Hebrews as a whole. If these 'confirmations' [signs and wonders, various miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit] have not occurred among them, then Hebrews' entire argument is empty and abstract" (89). Regarding the harsh warning of 6,4-6, he notes: "The enormity of apostasy is measured by the greatness of the experience of God it abandons. That is why it is impossible to 'renew to repentance' people who have proven capable of turning away from their own most powerful and transforming experience" (163).

Finally, Johnson is to be commended for his judicious handling of the sensitive issue of Hebrews' attitude to Judaism. Hebrews is unsurpassed in the NT in its contention the Christ event represents God's replacement of previous means of relating to his people (2,2-3; 3,3.5-6; 7,11-12.18-19.28; 8,5-7.13; 9,8-11; 10,1.9; 13,10). This replacement stands in continuity with what has come before, yet it represents the fulfillment of God's prior promises (1,1-2; 4,3.8-11; 7,23-28; 8,7-13; 9,8-10,23; 11,39-40). This program is principally responsible for the popular notion that Hebrews addresses a

community contemplating a return to Judaism. Johnson notes the importance of Hebrews' Christological and eschatological perspectives, as well as his experiences. "The inadequacy of the Israelite cult becomes fully apparent... only when the definition of the purpose of the cult changes, and the terms of understanding can change only in light of a new reality, indeed a new experience of personal transformation brought about by God through Jesus" (186). Hebrews thus offers a cultic version of "solution to plight" logic, rethinking the purpose of the cult in light of his experience of an inner, moral cleansing afforded by Jesus' priestly self-offering; this experience clearly surpasses the outer, ritual cleansing offered in the tabernacle/Temple cult (239, 246, 250, 253). Christ's inner cleansing establishes the "perfection" of the individual worshipper – allowing "actual contact with God... at the most intimate level" (186). This redefined purpose of worship "is in tension with the implied goal of the cult according to Scripture, which was the state of 'at-one-ness' between God and the people of Israel considered as a whole" (226). So also the covenant, which a fellow Jew "might insist... was never intended to secure the perfection of individual persons but rather the safety, stability, and sanctity of the people as a community dedicated to the one God of Israel" (211).

This short review only scratches the surface of this excellent work. Hebrews scholars will benefit for years to come from its wealth of insights; the Church will similarly find its appreciation enlarged for this 1<sup>st</sup> century masterpiece of early Christian thought and experience.

51 Rose Ave. 17  
Venice, CA 90291, USA

Scott D. MACKIE

Konrad HUBER, *Einer gleich einem Menschensohn. Die Christusvisionen in Offb 1,9-20 und Offb 14,14-20 und die Christologie der Johannesoffenbarung* (NAbh 51). Münster, Aschendorff, 2007. viii-361 pp. 16 × 24.

Revelation's Christology is communicated through the rich picture-language that engages the imagination of its readers. This evocative imagery has also led to widely differing assessments of the book's message. Some have argued that Revelation works with a Christology that is largely undeveloped, presenting a conglomeration of various that lack integration. Others counter that Revelation has one of the highest Christologies in the New Testament, comparable to those of John's gospel and Hebrews. Huber makes a significant contribution to this discussion by focusing on two visions that refer to Christ as the "one like a son of man" (Rev 1,9-20 and 14,14-20). In these texts he finds ample evidence of a well-developed Christology that ascribes traits of deity to the risen and exalted Jesus. Huber's book was originally his Habilitationsschrift, submitted to the Katholisch-Theologischen Privatuniversität at Linz.

A brief introduction is followed by section one, which is a summary of research on the Christology of Revelation. Special attention is given to treatments of the Lamb imagery, the Son of Man passages, and the question of whether Revelation works with an angelomorphic Christology. Throughout this section the positions of various scholars are described in a fair and balanced way, so that readers sense the breadth of research. What is less clear is how this survey establishes the context for Huber's own investigation. The many works mentioned adopt different methods of inquiry and take up different themes. It would have been helpful for Huber to locate himself more clearly within the currents of contemporary research that he has described, so that readers can clearly see why he has selected certain passages how his interpretive approach relates to those proposed by other scholars.

Section two is devoted to the inaugural vision in Rev 1,9-20. The treatment of the text consists largely of a careful exegetical discussion of each element in the passage. The result is a kind of running commentary on the vision. John's initial description of hearing a voice that was loud and sounded like a trumpet is reminiscent of biblical theophanies, like those at Sinai and in Ezekiel (1,10; Exod 19,16; Ezek 3,12). This gives an elevated, divine character to the encounter. Calling the majestic figure "one like a son of man" (Rev 1,13) means that he looks like a human being, but the expression recalls the figure on the clouds in Dan 7,13, giving him a heavenly quality. Moreover, Revelation gives the "one like a son of man" the white hair of the Ancient of Days (Dan 7,9) and the angelic being depicted in Dan 10,5-6. Such an elevated depiction of the Son of Man fits within the Jewish interpretive traditions reflected in 1 Enoch and 4 Ezra. Huber argues that Revelation's inaugural vision emphasizes the exalted Christ's role as Lord and judge. He emphasizes that the passage has the quality of a theophany rather than the appearance of an angel. It shows that Christ has a divine status that is to be contrasted with that of the angels (172-173).

Perhaps the most remarkable way that Christ is given the traits of God occurs at the end of the inaugural vision, where the exalted Jesus says, "I am (ἐγώ εἰμὶ) the first and the last" (1,17). In this context the ἐγώ εἰμὶ is suggestive of the divine name, and Jesus' statement echoes what was said by God, who declared, "I am the Alpha and the Omega" (1,8). Being first and last is characteristic of God (Isa 44,6; 48,12). Moreover, Jesus also identifies himself as the "living" one (Rev 1,18), and "living" is another trait of God (Deut 5,26; 32,40). To be "first" in the sense that God is presupposes preexistence, and living eternally is something true of God. By emphasizing these elements, Huber makes a strong case for a high Christology in Revelation.

Section three turns to the other principal passage, the vision of "one like a son of man" on the cloud in 14,14-20. Here again the focus is on Christ, and the vision includes elements of a theophany. The cloud is traditionally associated with divine manifestations and the seated posture is appropriate for someone who is a judge. The golden head wreath in this context signifies authority, power, majesty, and honor. The sharp sickle continues the judgment motif. The passage draws on the Son of Man vision of Dan 7,13, which also informs the opening chapter of Revelation, where John announces that Christ will come on the clouds (Rev 1,7) and then reports seeing the Son of Man among the lampstands (1,9-20). By including these exalted elements in the

portrayal of Christ in the central part of the book (14,14-20), Revelation reaffirms his divine majesty and royal authority.

What has been most debated about 14,14-20 is the nature of the judgment carried out. The vision has two parts. First, the Son of man reaps the harvest of the earth with his sickle, and then an angel reaps the grape clusters of the earth and puts them into the wine press of the wrath of God to be trampled. The emphasis on judgment in the second part is clear, especially since trampling grapes was used for judgment in the prophets (Joel 4,13; Jer 25,30-31; Isa 63,1-6). What is less clear is the significance of the first reaping. Some have argued that the two acts of reaping are parallel and signify judgment on the wicked. Others maintain that first reaping is positive, signifying the ingathering of the faithful, and that the second reaping is negative, symbolizing the judgment of the ungodly. Huber holds that the first reaping is not clearly positive or negative but is universal, since it affects the whole earth. In Revelation, the earth is a mixed region. In it one finds both the agents of evil and the people of God. Accordingly, Huber maintains that the Son of Man reaps the whole earth in 14,14-16 because he has authority over all of it, and the specific action of condemning the wicked occurs in the trampling of the winepress that follows in 14,17-20. This argument has considerable strength, though it still seems more plausible to think that the action of the Son of Man is the ingathering of the faithful, since harvest imagery was often positive (e.g., Matt 9,37-38; John 4,35-38) and it had a positive meaning earlier in this chapter (Rev 14,4).

Section four brings together the findings of the project. Of special interest are some of the tensions within the portrayals of Christ in the selected passages. In 1,9-20 Christ is present among the churches, whereas in 14,14-20 he is a more distant figure bringing judgment to the entire world. Again, the Son of Man has many attributes of God and is also God's Messiah, who was crucified and has now risen. In other words, Christ is both identified with God and yet differentiated from God. Such tensions add vibrancy to Revelation's Christology. In this section Huber also notes the importance of two other Christological texts, including the vision of the Lamb, where Christ shares the throne of God (5,6-14), and the vision of Christ's return, where he is given the titles of God, including King of kings and Lord of lords (19,11-21). Like the Son of Man texts, these other two visions reflect a high Christology in which Christ shares the majesty of God and yet is differentiated from God. Relating the Son of Man passages more fully to the visions in Revelation 5 and 19 would help show dimensions of Revelation's Christology more clearly.

One of the strengths of Huber's work is the attention to exegetical details in the selected texts. His book also invites renewed conversation between the fields of theology and New Testament study. Although a comprehensive Christology would require more work with Revelation 5 and 19, along with the Son of Man passages, Huber has provided a solid basis for interdisciplinary discussion of Revelation's theology. Nearly all of the exegetical work draws on Jewish sources for the imagery, and these materials are integral to our understanding of the text. But Huber also notes that aspects of the Roman world, such as the imperial cult, contributed to the situation in which Revelation was composed (92-103). Since questions of dominion figure prominently in Revelation's Christology, it would be helpful to

consider ways in which the majestic portrayals of Christ might relate to the language and imagery of John's imperial context. Huber has provided a helpful basis from which to continue exploring such questions.

Luther Seminary  
2481 Como Ave., St. Paul, MN, USA

Craig R. KOESTER

## Varia

Martin HENGEL – Anna Maria SCHWEMER, *Jesus und das Judentum. Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, Band I, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2007. xxiv-749 pp. 16 × 23,5. €99

Con questo volume i due noti Autori danno inizio a (e anche l'annuncio di) un ambizioso progetto di "Storia del cristianesimo primitivo", che comprenderà altri due volumi: un secondo sugli anni dal 30 al 48 (cioè, dalla morte di Gesù fino al cosiddetto concilio di Gerusalemme) e un terzo sul complesso periodo che va fino alla fine del II secolo.

L'opera presente, dunque, articolata in 22 paragrafi, è interamente dedicata alla figura storica di Gesù di Nazaret. E, per quanto si può constatare, essa è impostata sulla base di un paio di criteri fondamentali. Il primo è quello enunciato nel titolo stesso e riguarda l'inserimento di Gesù nel giudaismo, inteso non solo come ambito cronologicamente contemporaneo alle sue prese di posizione, ma anche come grandezza ideale alla quale egli appartiene *in toto*. Ampliando la visione sull'intero cristianesimo delle origini, gli AA. giungono ad affermare che nell'insieme del Nuovo Testamento ciò che si etichetta come "ellenistico" di fatto proviene normalmente da fonti giudaiche, le quali né volevano né potevano sottrarsi alla *koiné* religiosa del periodo ellenistico (cf. 22). Essi però mantengono comunque una distinzione tra Gerusalemme, dove era di casa un "jüdischer Hellenismus" caratterizzato più fortemente da una lettura giuridica della lettera della Tora, e Alessandria, aperta a una comprensione più filosofica del testo sacro. In effetti, le pagine 37-168 (= §§ 3-4) sono dedicate alla presentazione dell'ambiente giudaico, esaminato dal punto di vista sia politico (sull'arco di tempo 63 a.C. - 73 d.C.) sia religioso (con una descrizione dei cosiddetti "partiti" e la loro rilevanza sociale). In ogni caso, la limitazione dell'ambito religioso-culturale di appartenenza proprio di Gesù non esimerà gli AA. dal ricorrere opportunamente ad elementi tipicamente greci, com'è il caso per alcuni versi molto istruttivo del racconto della storia di Alessandro Magno (cf. 195 e 491).

Il secondo criterio è quello che dà materia al corpo del volume e riguarda la precisa figura di Gesù. A proposito delle fonti che lo riguardano, è interessante la limitazione di fatto ai soli Sinottici, con esclusione non solo del



Vangelo di Giovanni, ma anche del Vangelo di Tommaso, alla cui datazione antica sostenuta per esempio da J.D. Crossan gli AA. si oppongono con forza (cf. 240-243). Ai Sinottici viene riconosciuto un interesse sostanzialmente 'biografico', ma, benché si esprima una forte critica a certe componenti della *Formengeschichte*, si mantiene ferma la convinzione che "la polemica fondamentalista contro il metodo storico-critico non sa cosa sia la conoscenza storica" (261), essendo limitate le nostre possibilità di una ricostruzione storiografica (notevole è la tesi già proposta dal grande storico dell'antichità Th. Mommsen nel 1843 e citata alla p. 263: *historiam totam esse hypotheticam*).

Su questi presupposti gli AA. espongono le varie componenti della vicenda gesuana, il cui punto di partenza è costituito non dalla nascita ma dalla comparsa di Giovanni il Battezzatore: anche se il suo intervento "bleibt in vielem rätselhaft" (312), egli con il suo battesimo si pone in conflitto con il culto del Tempio e l'aristocrazia sacerdotale. Dopo un periodo di discepolato nei confronti del Battista, Gesù se ne stacca e se ne differenzia decisamente per la nuova concezione di un Dio che ama il peccatore.

A questo punto l'esposizione si articola in tre grandi blocchi. Il primo concerne la comparsa pubblica di Gesù e la sua predicazione (§§ 11-15, 341-458). La cornice cronologica è individuata tra la fine dell'anno 27 (o inizio del 28) e la Pasqua dell'anno 30. La sua predicazione/annuncio del Regno di Dio viene distinta nettamente da una formazione scolastica di tipo didattico, anche per il fatto che Gesù parla in nome proprio e non come i Rabbini che si riferiscono ad altri maestri. Dal punto di vista formale, Gesù si esprime in forma poetica secondo le tecniche della retorica ebraico-aramaica, comprese le parabole. Gli AA. ritengono giustamente che la *basileia* predicata da Gesù combini insieme una chiara dimensione di futuro ma anche un originale riferimento al suo presente, e che egli, pur non essendo un "Gesetzesbrecher", tuttavia pensa che le richieste della Tora devono recedere di fronte al comandamento dell'amore (da cui derivano i vari conflitti con i suoi interlocutori).

Il secondo blocco comprende l'azione di Gesù e la sua pretesa messianica (§§ 16-17, 459-548). Sono notevoli le pagine 483-497, che contengono una discussione generale sui racconti di miracolo, sulla loro attendibilità e sulla loro qualità interpretativa (sorprendentemente alla p. 495 si trovano riferimenti a Don Bosco, Giovanni Maria Vianney, e persino a Padre Pio!). L'identità personale di Gesù viene definita come quella di un "profeta messianico", in quanto in lui si compiono le promesse antiche, come anche rivelano le sue "Ich-Worte" (in polemica con la concezione del segreto messianico da parte di Wrede). A Gesù e non alla comunità viene riconosciuto l'appellativo di "Figlio dell'uomo" (ma va notata una carenza di informazione bibliografica sull'uso rabbinico del sintagma come circonlocuzione per dire "io" o "qualunque uomo"). Quanto poi alla qualifica di Figlio, si poteva insistere di più sull'uso del termine aramaico "Abbà" applicato a Dio (cf. i veloci accenni in 417, 457-458, 543).

Il terzo blocco è consacrato alla Passione, il cui racconto è analizzato nei vari dettagli a partire dall'azione compiuta nel Tempio (§§ 18-21, 549-621). Noto che gli AA. si allineano alla tesi di Jeremias, secondo cui l'Ultima cena fu una cena pasquale, ma purtroppo non vengono discusse le obiezioni che portano a sostenere la posizione contraria di una cena d'addio. In più, osservo che, a proposito del processo giudaico, alla pagina 595 si enunciano due te-

mi propri del racconto marciano, ma se ne enumera solo uno (la parola contro il Tempio) e, certo per una svista, si dimentica di enumerare il secondo (che dovrebbe essere la questione della messianicità di Gesù trattata in 597s). Interessante è la precisazione, secondo cui il diritto romano non permetteva di onorare un defunto condannato, compresa la sua sepoltura; perciò, se Gesù viene sepolto, forse si deve scorgere in ciò un accenno al fatto che Pilato non considerò la colpa di Gesù troppo pesante (cf. 620).

Il volume si chiude con un paragrafo su "La testimonianza sulla risurrezione di Gesù" (623-652). Gli AA. si limitano a spiegare il testo di 1 Cor 15,3-8 insistendo sulla maggiore importanza delle cristofanie rispetto al sepolcro vuoto, e sostenendo che comunque "in molti punti esiste una continuità dimostrabile tra il comportamento di Gesù in parola e azione e l'annuncio della chiesa primitiva" (654). Addirittura essi terminano con una frecciata contro la celebre idea di G.E. Lessing (pur senza citarlo) sul "brutto, largo fossato" (*garstiger breiter Graben*) che ci separerebbe dal Gesù della storia: "Se questo fosse vero, l'annuncio di Gesù non avrebbe mai raggiunto i Non-giudei di lingua greca in quanto "Evangelo"" (ib.).

In conclusione, i due AA. hanno scritto una sorta di manuale non tanto sulla questione quanto sulla figura del Gesù storico. I frequenti aggettivi "irreführend, abwegig" in polemica con tesi estreme denotano l'opera in senso non esattamente 'conservatore/tradizionale' ma certamente molto equilibrato e moderato. Perciò, nel panorama della produzione in materia l'opera si distingue per un forte senso della misura, oltre che per l'alto livello della trattazione.

Pontificia Università Lateranense  
Roma

Romano PENNA

Joseph H. HELLERMAN, *Jesus and the People of God. Reconfiguring Ethnic Identity* (New Testament Monographs 21). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xii-381 pp. 16 × 24.

Dans cette longue enquête fouillée sur la position de Jésus par rapport aux lois rituelles juives, ce que d'aucuns préfèrent appeler, notamment à la suite de James Dunn, les marqueurs identitaires (Boundary-markers) du Judaïsme (circoncision, lois alimentaires, sabbat), l'auteur défend la position, assez peu commune il est vrai, selon laquelle Jésus lui-même aurait consciemment voulu les subvertir au cours de son ministère galiléen pour bâtir une communauté organisée autour d'autres critères. Il n'est donc pas étonnant que le livre s'achève par une citation de Ga 3,28, le verset par ailleurs le plus cité (cinq fois) du NT (hors Évangiles).

L'introduction (3-4) énonce très clairement le plan lequel sera fidèlement suivi. L'auteur entend démontrer cinq affirmations: Premièrement la crise maccabéenne a engendré un souci de plus en plus marqué pour la défense de l'identité juive qui a entraîné une insistance plus grande qu'auparavant sur la circoncision, les lois alimentaires et le shabbat. Deuxièmement: cette

idéologie n'a cessé de se développer jusqu'au Christ et représentait la mentalité dominante du temps de la domination romaine. Troisièmement, Jésus a volontairement défié les distinctions traditionnelles entre temps profane et temps sacré (le shabbat), aliments autorisés et interdits (les lois alimentaires), espace sacré et espace profane (le Temple). Quatrièmement, la façon dont Jésus voyait le peuple de Dieu était celle d'une famille, celle des enfants de Dieu et non celle des descendants charnels d'Abraham. Selon Jésus, appartient au Royaume quiconque fait la volonté de Dieu. Cinquièmement, la relativisation par Jésus des symboles nationaux a fourni la fondation idéologique et le cadre symbolique qui ont permis aux premiers chrétiens de sortir des limites du judaïsme ethnique dans les années suivant immédiatement le ministère de Jésus.

Son analyse de la façon dont le judaïsme en est venu à survaloriser fortement les marqueurs identitaires à partir de la crise maccabéenne en réponse à la crise d'identité provoquée par la séduction de la culture grecque, est particulièrement fouillée et convaincante (chapitres 1 à 3). Mais il le savait! "I suspect that I will satisfactorily demonstrate to most readers the accuracy of the first and second statement above" (3). Comme il le reconnaît lui-même, si les deux premiers points seront facilement acceptés par ses lecteurs, il n'en va pas de même du troisième qui va plutôt contre le courant dominant de l'exégèse récente: "Assertion #3 will likely prove more problematic, particularly for scholars who have difficulty imagining a Jesus who would challenge common Jewish praxis in the area of purity" (4). En effet, si Jésus avait été si clair dans sa critique des lois rituelles, notamment alimentaires, comment expliquer que les premiers chrétiens aient connu tant de conflits sur ces questions comme en témoignent tant les Actes des Apôtres que les lettres de Paul ? L'auteur préfère penser qu'ils ont connu en quelque sorte une 'rechute' dans leur désir d'être accepté par une société extrêmement sensible sur ces questions: "In Judea... Jewish Christians would have been understandably cautious about extending to its logical conclusion the social trajectory established by Jesus. Nor did they particularly have reason to do so, given the monochromatic ethnic make-up of the Jerusalem community" (264). Le chapitre 8 cherche à répondre aux inévitables objections ("Jesus and his followers": Anticipating Objections). Ainsi, comme il le redira plus avant, l'auteur trouve plus logique d'imaginer une pratique naissant du Jésus historique qu'une communauté jésuanique 'inventant' d'elle-même un tel écart vis-à-vis de la Tradition: il exprime une "preference for a anomalous Jesus, rather than an anomalous Jesus movement" (97). Peut-être faut-il tenir à la fois l'enracinement dans la pratique de Jésus et la créativité des premières communautés inspirées par l'Esprit? La façon dont il suggère que les repas de Jésus avec les pécheurs a pu ouvrir la voie à la pratique des repas avec les païens me paraît aller dans ce sens: "By eating with 'tax-collectors and sinners' Jesus effectively repositions the boundary that defined the people of Yahweh, so as to include any descendant of Abraham who will embrace his program for the Israel' renewal" (214).

L'édition est extrêmement soignée avec une riche bibliographie (quoique très marquée par la recherche américaine et avec une surreprésentation d'auteurs de la mouvance évangélique) et deux bons index (des textes et des auteurs). Il arrive occasionnellement à l'auteur de citer des auteurs

francophones comme M.-F. Baslez (78). Même si cela est rare (notons en passant la coquille ‘armies’ pour ‘armées’, 351), cela vaut d’être relevé.

En conclusion, on ne peut s’empêcher de penser que l’on peut dire de son livre ce que l’auteur dit lui-même de Dunn à propos d’un Jésus ‘family-friendly’, favorable à la famille: He “has overstated a good case” (272). On ne peut que l’approuver lorsqu’il met en valeur un Jésus qui a une vision inclusive de la nouvelle communauté des disciples rassemblés par un Père accueillant largement: “By substituting a surrogate family model of social organization for the traditional notion of God’s people as the lineal descendants of Abraham, and forcefully challenging the values of post-Maccabean Jewish nationalism, Jesus thus laid the conceptual foundation for his movement to transcend the boundaries of ethnic Judaism in the decades to follow” (308). Mais de là à faire de Jésus un “entrepreneur de l’ethnicité” (chapitre 10 “Jesus as an Ethnic Entrepreneur”), quelqu’un qui aurait mis au premier plan de son agenda la reconfiguration de l’ethnicité d’Israël sur d’autres bases que celles mises en avant depuis le temps des Maccabées, me paraît forcer le trait.

L’auteur reconnaît d’ailleurs plusieurs fois la fragilité de ce focalisation sur la critique de l’identité juive dans la mission terrestre de Jésus. Il me semble révélateur que l’adjectif “embryonic” vienne plusieurs fois qualifier ces affirmations (122, 233, 238, 256, 264) pour dire comment la pratique et l’enseignement de Jésus a été à l’origine de ce que les premières communautés ont peu à peu discerné. Une de ses formules dit de façon typique: “This is not to argue, of course, that Jesus explicitly abrogated the food laws during his earthly ministry, or that Jesus himself ate with Gentiles. It is simply to point out that the DNA of Jewish-Gentile table fellowship is present in embryonic form, so to speak, in Jesus teaching on food and purity in Matthew 15 / Mark 7” (256). Ce qui vaut des lois alimentaires me semblent valoir aussi pour le shabbat et la circoncision. Oui la pratique de la première Eglise s’enracine nécessairement dans l’enseignement et la pratique du Christ mais il faut faire la part du développement de ce qui précisément était en germe et non encore clairement développé dans l’enseignement de Jésus. Malgré le soin pris dans le chapitre 6 à réfuter les objections possibles, ce fameux troisième point n’emporte pas totalement la conviction. Certaines formulations en passant me semblent plus nuancées et, de ce fait, plus vraisemblables comme: “Jesus laid the symbolic foundation for the dismantling of ethnic boundaries in the later church by means of his unsympathetic stance towards the vital covenant symbols of sacred times, sacred space, and sacred food. Jesus’ teachings and actions regarding purity were at times somewhat ambiguous, however, and their embryonic form inevitably left them open to a variety of interpretations” (256). C’est pourquoi d’ailleurs il juge l’incise du narrateur en Mc 7,19b (“ainsi il déclarait purs tous les aliments”) être un commentaire marcier traduisant la formule plus ambiguë de Jésus transmise en Mt 15,11: “Ce n’est pas ce qui entre dans la bouche qui rend l’homme impur”.

L’auteur a eu le mérite d’essayer de décrire un Jésus choquant pour la mentalité religieuse dominante de son temps. Son étude se doit d’être lue pour qui veut reprendre le dossier du rapport de Jésus aux lois rituelles et à la Torah en général. En outre son insistance sur l’aspect décisif de la métaphore

familiale pour comprendre la communauté messianique inaugurée par Jésus me semble très juste. Les disciples de Jésus se veulent les enfants d'un Père qui aime tous les hommes plutôt que les citoyens d'une nation élue devant s'opposer aux païens. Sur ce point, J. Hellerman poursuit avec ce livre un travail inauguré par son *The Ancient Church as Family* publié en 2001.

Ce travail se recommande par l'extrême honnêteté avec laquelle l'auteur énonce ses présupposés, par son analyse complète des sources et par un désir d'édifier la communauté chrétienne. Toute sa pointe repose sur le sens que l'on donnera au terme "embryonic". Mais il répond certainement à l'un des critères d'authenticité énoncé par J.P. Meier dans son ouvrage sur le Jésus historique: à savoir que le portrait de Jésus que l'on présente doit expliquer pourquoi il avait été perçu comme une menace réelle par les leaders religieux du temps pour être ainsi livré aux Romains pour être crucifié.

Communauté Pierre Favre  
128 Rue Blomet  
F-75015 Paris

Marc RASTOIN

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

## Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 2008-2009. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 326, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	29	243	15	287
Fac. Orientalistica	1	4	34	39
Universi	30	247	49	326
Nationes	61	Alumni	326	
Dioeceses	149	Alumni	157	
Inst. Religiosorum	43	Alumni	96	
Inst. Religiosarum	12	Alumnae	12	
Ex statu laicali	61	Alumnae	35	
		Alumni	26	

### Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

VERSACI Cirino, *Il delirio dell'onnipotenza*. La critica al potere e alla sua storia in Is 14,4b-20. Egesi e intertestualità della pericope (magna cum laude) — Moderatore: Prof. SIMIAN-YOFRE Horacio, S.J.

PEREIRA DELGADO Alvaro, *De Apóstol a esclavo. El 'exemplum' de Pablo en 1 Corintios 9* (summa cum laude) — Moderatore: Prof. ALETTI Jean-Noël, S.J.

BADIOLA SAENZ DE UGARTE José Antonio, *La voluntad de Dios Padre en el evangelio de Mateo* (magna cum laude) — Moderatore: Prof. STOCK Klemens, S.J.

LARROQUE Laurent, *La parabole du serviteur impitoyable (Mt 18,21-35) dans le contexte de Matthieu* (magna cum laude) — Moderatore: Prof. STOCK Klemens, S.J.

KABATI KIBETI Gabriel, *Le Père et ses dons. Aspects théologiques, christologiques et éthiques des références à Dieu Père en Mt 5-7* (magna cum laude) — Moderator: Prof. STOCK Klemens, S.J.

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

La liste ci-dessous comprend tous les livres adressés à Biblica qui sont en rapport avec les études bibliques, y compris ceux qui ne pourront faire l'objet d'un compte rendu. En signalant un ouvrage, la Revue ne se prononce pas à son sujet.

Les livres envoyés à la Revue ne seront pas retournés à l'expéditeur, même si aucun compte rendu n'en est publié (à moins qu'ils n'aient été envoyés sur demande de la Direction).

Les livres et les articles ou extraits de revues qui nous sont adressés seront communiqués au directeur de l'Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography.

Prière d'adresser les envois à la «Direction de Biblica, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italie».

**Mandolfo**, Carleen R., *Daughter Zion Talks Back to the Prophets*. A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations (Semeia Studies 58). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. ix-149 p. 15 × 23. \$24.95

**Manzi**, Franco, *Paolo, apostolo del Risorto*. Sfidando le crisi a Corinto. Cinisello Balsamo, San Paolo, 2008. 219 p. 14,5 × 21. €14

**Marchal**, Joseph A., *Hierarchy, Unity, and Imitation*. A Feminist Rhetorical Analysis of Power Dynamics in Paul's Letter to the Philippians (Academia Biblica 24). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. vii- 261 p. 15 × 23. £22.95

**Martini**, Carlo Maria, *Gli esercizi Ignaziani*. Alla luce del vangelo di Luca (Bibbia e Preghiera). Nuova edizione. Roma, Edizioni AdP, 2007. 270 p. 12 × 19. €16

**Matera**, Frank, *New Testament Theology*, Exploring Diversity and Unity. Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2007. xxxi-485 p. 15 × 23. £27.99

**McDonald**, Lee Martin, *The Biblical Canon*. Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority. Updated, and revised 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2007. xli-546 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**McKnight**, Scot – **Modica**, Joseph B. (eds.), *Who Do My Opponents Say That I Am?* An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus (Library of New Testament Studies 327). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2008. xi-175 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Meadowcroft**, Tim, *Haggai* (Readings. A New Biblical Commentary). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. xii-259 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Merlo**, Paolo (a cura di), *L'Antico Testamento*. Introduzione storico-letteraria (Frecce 60). Roma, Carocci editore, 2008. 329 p. 15 × 22. €28,50

**Mettinger**, Tryggve, *The Eden Narrative*. A Literary and religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2007. xvii-165 p. 16 × 23,5. \$29.50

**Middlemas**, Jill, *The Templeless Age*. An Introduction to the History, Literature, and Theology of the "Exile". Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2007. x-174 p. 15 × 23. £13.99

**Mies**, Françoise (éd.), *Bible et philosophie*. Les lumières de la raison (Le livre et le rouleau 30). Namur, Presses Universitaires de Namur – Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 2007. 194 p. 14, × 20,5

**Miscall**, Peter D., *Isaiah* (Readings. A New Biblical Commentary). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. 185 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Moore**, Stephen D., *Empire and Apocalypse*. Postcolonialism and the New Testament (The Bible in the Modern World 12). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. x-160 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Morrow**, William S., *Protest against God*. The Eclipse of a Biblical Tradition (Hebrew Bible Monographs 4). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xii-250 p. 15,5 × 23,5.

**Moyise**, Steve – **Menken**, Maarten J. J. (eds.), *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel (Library of New Testament Studies 358). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xi-195 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Navon**, Chaim, *Genesis and Jewish Thought*. Jersey City, KTAV Publishing House Inc. – Alon Shevut, Israel, Yeshivat Har Etzion, 2008. x-379 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Neyrey**, Jerome H., S. J., *Give God the Glory*. Ancient Prayer and Worship in Cultural Perspective. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. x-273 p. 15 × 23. \$20.00 – £10.99

**Nihan**, Christophe, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*. A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus (FAT 25). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2007. xviii-687 p. 15,5 × 23. €99

**Nutu**, Ela, *Incarnate Word, Inscribed Flesh*. John's Prologue and the Postmodern (The Bible and the Modern World 6). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xii-199 p. 16 × 24

**O'Kane**, Martin, *Painting the Text*. The Artist as Biblical Interpreter (The Bible in the Modern World 8). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiv-234 p. 16 × 24

**Odell-Scott**, David (ed.), *Reading Romans with Contemporary Philosophers and Theologians* (Romans Through History and Culture 7). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. vii-297 p. 15 × 23. £25.00

**Ogden**, Graham S., *Qohelet* (Readings. A New Biblical Commentary). Second Edition. Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. 252 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Otto**, Eckhart, *Mosé*. Storia e leggenda (Sintesi). Brescia, Editrice Queriniana, 2007. 166 p. 11,5 × 19. €12,50

**Perkins**, PHEME, *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xvi-312 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$28.00 – £15.99

**Philostorgius**, *Church History* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 23). Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Philip R. Amidon, S. J. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xxv-284 p. 15 × 23. \$34.95

**Pinto**, Sebastiano, *Saremo anche noi come tutti i popoli*. La nascita della monarchia (1 Sam 8-11) e il ritorno dall'esilio (Esdra) riletti in chiave biblico-sociologica (Parola di Dio 27). Cinisello Balsamo (Mi), Edizioni San Paolo, 2008. 205 p. 14,5 × 21. €14



**Plant, R. J. R.**, *Good Figs, Bad Figs*. Judicial Differentiation in the Book of Jeremiah (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 481). New York – London, T&T Clark, 2008. xv-224 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Plietzsch, Susanne** (Hrsg.), *Literatur im Dialog*. Die Faszination von Talmud und Midrasch. Zürich, Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2007. 173 p. 15 × 22,5. SFr 32 – €22 – EUA 22,70

**Porter, Stanley E.** – **O'Donnell, Matthew Brook** – **Porter, Wendy J.** (eds.), *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism: Volume 3* (2006). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. 246 p. 16 × 24

**Puig y Tàrrrech, Amand** (a cura di), *El matrimoni i l'ús dels béns en la Bíblia* (Scripta Biblica 8). Tarragona, Publicacions de l'abadia de Montserrat, 2008. 288 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Reese, Ruth Anne**, *2 Peter and Jude* (The two horizons New Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. x-234 p. 16 × 23,5. \$20.00 – £10.99

**Rius-Camps, Josep** – **Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny**, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae*. A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition. Volume 3. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xiii-401 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Roetzel, Calvin J.** – **Foster, Robert L.** (eds.), *The Impartial God*. Essays in Biblical Studies in Honor of Jouette M. Bassler (New Testament Monographs 22). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiv-272 p. 16 × 24

**Rohde, Michael**, *Der Knecht Hiob im Gespräch mit Mose*. Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Hiobbuch (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 26). Leipzig, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007. 255 p. 16 × 23,5

**Roncace, Mark** – **Gray, Patrick** (eds.), *Teaching the Bible through Popular Culture and the Arts* (Resources for Biblical Studies 53). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. vii-393 p. 15 × 23. \$37.95

**Rooke, Deborah W.** (ed.), *A Question of Sex? Gender and Difference in the Hebrew Bible and Beyond* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 14). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xi-184 p. 16 × 24

**Rossetti, Marco**, *Giuseppe negli scritti di Qumran*. La figura del patriarca a partire da 4Q372 1 (Nuova Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 3). Roma, LAS, 2007. 336 p. 17 × 24. €22

**Runia, David T.** – **Sterling, Gregory E.** (eds.), *The Studia Philonica Annual* (Studies in Hellenistic Judaism 19). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. viii-239 p. 16 × 23,5. \$39.95

**Ryan, Roger**, *Judges* (Readings. A New Biblical Commentary). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiv-221 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Sasson, Vanessa R.**, *The Birth of Moses and the Buddha* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 9). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiii-216 p. 16 × 24

**Schabert, Jane**, *The Illegitimacy of Jesus*. A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives. Expanded Twentieth Anniversary Edition. Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. x-318 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth**, *The Power of the Word*. Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2007. viii-280 p. 15 × 22,5. \$19.00

**Segovia, Fernando F.** – **Sugirtharajah, R. S.** (eds.), *A Postcolonial Commentary on the New Testament Writings* (The Bible and Postcolonialism 13). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. x-466 p. 16 × 24. £80.00

**Settembrini**, Marco, *Sapienza e storia in Dn 7-12* (AnBib 169). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2007. 263 p. 16,5 × 24

**Shanks**, Hershel, *Jerusalem's Temple Mount*. From Solomon to the Golden Dome. New York – London, Continuum, 2007. x-206 p. 22 × 28,5. £19,99

**Sigal**, Phillip, *The Halakhah of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of Matthew* (Studies in Biblical Literature 18). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xxvii-262 p. 15 × 23. \$29,95

**Sjöberg**, Mikeal, *Wrestling with Textual Violence*. The Jephthah Narrative in Antiquity and Modernity (The Bible in the Modern World 4). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. x-251 p. 16 × 24

**Skarsaune**, Oskar – **Hvalvik**, Reidar (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. The Early Centuries. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2007. xxx-930 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$49,95 – £27,99

**Smith**, Barry D., *What Must I Do to Be Saved?* Paul Parts Company with His Jewish Heritage (New Testament Monographs 17). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiii-285 p. 16 × 24

**Smith**, Craig A., *Timothy's Task, Paul's Prospect*. A New Reading of 2 Timothy (New Testament Monographs 12). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. xii-267 p. 16 × 24

**Snodgrass**, Klyne, *Stories with Intent*. A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008. xviii-846 p. 16 × 24. \$50,00 – £27,99

**Soloveitchik**, Joseph B., *Abraham's Journey*. Reflections on the Life of the Founding Patriarch (MeOtzar HoRav Series 9). Jersey City, KTAV Publishing House, 2008. xv-224 p. 16 × 23,5. \$25,00

**Spronck**, Joël, *La patience de Dieu*. Justifications théologiques du délai de la parousie. (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia 60). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2008. 352 p. 17 × 24.

**Stackert**, Jeffrey, *Rewriting the Torah*. Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation (FAT 52). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2007. xi-273 p. 16 × 23,5. €79

**Still**, Todd D., (ed.), *Jesus and Paul Reconnected*. Fresh Pathways into an Old Debate. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xvi-166 p. 15 × 23. \$22,00 – £12,99

**Strelan**, Rick, *Luke the Priest*. The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel. Aldershot – Burlington, VT, Ashgate, 2008. xi-194 p. 16 × 24. £50,00

**Subramanian**, J. Samuel, *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy* (Library of New Testament Studies 351). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xx-166 p. 15 × 23. £55,00

**Sugirtharajah**, R. S. (ed.), *Still at the Margins*. Biblical Scholarship Fifteen Years after *Voices from the Margin*. London – New York. T&T Clark, 2008. ix-163. 16 × 24. £65,00

**Sumney**, Jerry L., *Philippians*. A Greek Student's Intermediate Reader. Peabody. Hendrickson Publishers, 2007. xxiv-161 p. 17,5 × 23,5. \$14,95 – £8,99

**Talbert**, Charles H., *Ephesians and Colossians* (IIAIEIA paideia Commentaries on the New Testament). Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Academic, 2007. xix-296 p. 15 × 23. \$24,99

**Tamez, Elsa**, *Struggles for Power in Early Christianity*. A Study of the First Letter to Timothy. Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 2007. xxv-163 p. 13,5 × 21

**Thatcher, Tom** (ed.), *What We Have Heard from the Beginning*. The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2007. xix-423 p. 15 × 22,5. \$34.95 – £19.99

*The "Belly-Myther" of Endor*. Interpretations of 1 Kings 28 in the Early Church (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 16). Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Rowan A. **Greer** and Margaret M. **Mitchell**. Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. clvii-189 p. 15 × 23. £22.99

**Twelftree, Graham H.**, *In the Name of Jesus*. Exorcism among Early Christians. Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2007. 351 p. 15 × 23. \$26.99

**Valentini, Alberto**, *Maria secondo le Scritture*. Figlia di Sion e Madre del Signore. Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 2007. 500 p. 14 × 21,5. €40

**van der Watt, Jan**, *An Introduction to the Johannine Gospel and Letters* (T&T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. x-151 p. 13,5 × 21,5. £14.99

**van Peursen, W. Th.**, *Language and Interpretation in the Syriac Text of Ben Sira*. A Comparative Linguistic and Literary Study (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden 16). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2007. xvi-474. 16,5 × 24,5. €139 – \$199.00

**Vander Stichele, Caroline** – **Hunter, Alastair G.** (eds.), *Creation and Creativity*. From Genesis to Genetics and Back (The Bible in the Modern World 8; Amsterdam Studies in the Bible and Religion 1). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. xii-221 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Vermes, Geza**, *The Resurrection*. New York – London – Toronto, Doubleday, 2008. xix-171 p. 14,5 × 21,5. \$18.95

**Voorwinde, Stephen**, *Jesus' Emotions in the Fourth Gospel*. Human or Divine? (Library of New Testament Studies 284). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2005. xiii-344 p. 16 × 24. £75.00

**Voris, Stephen J.**, *Preaching Parables*. A Metaphorical Interfaith Approach. New York – Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 2008. xi-220 p. 15 × 23. \$19.95

**Watson, Francis**, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*. Beyond the New Perspective. Revised and Expanded Edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xvi-400 p. 16 × 24,5. \$32.00 – £17.99

**Watts, James W.**, *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus*. From Sacrifice to Scripture. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. xix-257 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £50.00 – \$85.00

**West, Gerald O.** (ed.), *Reading Other-wise*. Socially Engaged Scholars Reading with their Communities (Semeia Studies 62). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. vii-170 p. 15 × 23. £13.99

**Westcott, B. F.** – **Hort, F. J. A.**, *The Greek New Testament*. With comparative Apparatus showing variations from the Nestle-Aland and Robinson-Pierpont Editions. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2007. xxviii-893 p. 13 × 19,5. £19.99 – \$34.95

**Wilken, Robert Louis**, *I cristiani visti dai romani* (Studi biblici 155). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2007. 270 p. 13,5 × 21. €27,90

**Williamson, H. G. M.** (ed.), *Understanding the History of Ancient Israel* (Proceedings of the British Academy 143). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007. xx-432 p. 16 × 24. £50.00

**Willi-Plein, Ina**, *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare 24,4). Zürich, Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2007. 306 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Witherington, Ben III**, *Making a Meal of It*. Rethinking the Theology of the Lord's Supper. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2007. xi-160 p. 15,5 × 23,5

**Witherington, Ben III**, *The Letters to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians*. A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Captivity Epistles. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xii-382 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$38.00 – £21.99

**Yamasaki, Gary**, *Watching a Biblical Narrative*. Point of View in Biblical Exegesis. New York – London, T&T Clark, 2008. vii-230 p. 16 × 24. £80.00

**Yee, Gale A.** (ed.), *Judges and Method*. New Approaches in Biblical Studies. Second Edition. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2007. ix-284 p. 14 × 21,5

**Zajac, Ewa**, *Potop w tradycji biblijnej oraz literaturze judaizmu okresu Drugiej Świątyni* (Studia Biblica Lublinensia). Lublin, Wydawnictwo KUL, 2007. 295 p. 17 × 24

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com>

---

MICHELE SIMONE, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il 14 ottobre 2009

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma